

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 14 No. 56

3rd November, 1934

CONTENTS

Politics	
Foreign Political Review of the Week	1475
Obarov: The Responsibility of Fascist Germany for the Marseilles Assassinations	1476
Vlachov: The Assassinations in Marseilles and the Move- ment for Macedonian Freedom	1477
United States	
W. R.: The Coming Elections in the U.S.A.	1479
M. Morris: Reorganisation of the N.R.A.	1480
Germany	
The Frame-Up against Thaelmann—an International Pro- vocation	1482
Robert: The Situation in the German High Schools	1483
Spain	
The Epic of Asturias	1484
Fight for the Unity of the Labour Movement	
R. Bishop: The C.P.G.B. Stands for Unity	1486
G. Friedrich: The Czech Social Democracy on the Negotia- tions of the Two Internationals	1487
The Labour Movement	
Karl Reeve: Lessons of the General Textile Strike in the U.S.A.	1488
Fight against Fascism	
Joe North: U.S.A. Second Congress against War and Fascism	1490
Vicente Guerna: The First National Congress against Fascism and War in Mexico	1491
The White Terror	
The Hungarian Fascists Want to Kill Rákosi	1492
Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution	
On the Eve of the Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution	1494
The Achievements of the Second Year of the Second Five- Year Plan	1494
D. Saslavsky: Genoa 1922—Geneva 1934	1495
In the International	
The C.P. of Yugoslavia on the Assassinations in Marseilles	1497
Trade Union Movement	
O. Piatnitzky: Questions of the International Trade Union Movement	1498
Fight against Imperialist War	
P. F.: The Revelations at the American Armaments Enquiry	1501
Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union	
A. Komjat: Letters from the Soviet Union	1502

The Congress of the French Radical Party

By I. Berlioz (Paris)

The editor of one of the biggest Paris newspapers ("Temps") declared, after having been present at the National Congress of the French Radical Party, which has just taken place in Nantes:

"It was a tremendous achievement to have obtained from this congress a unanimous vote in favour of the maintenance of the political truce. It was the achievement of all the leaders of the party who did everything possible to obtain it."

This is very true. The resolutions adopted by the congress are confused and full of deliberately ambiguous and deceptive formulas. The resolutions permit the continuation of the co-operation between the Radical Party and the reactionary parties within the government of National Union, although they express regret at the violent attacks made by many of the leaders of the reactionary parties on individual leaders of the Radical Party. The resolutions agree to the State reform along the lines proposed by Tardieu and Doumergue, although they try to give the impression that they are opposed to the Cabinet being given the exclusive right of dissolving the Chamber of Deputies, a right which was previously dependent on the confirmation of the Senate.

In other words, the resolution of the congress on the State reform and on the programmatic declaration of the party which was unanimously adopted by the congress is an attempt to harmonise the unclear and confused desires of the membership of the party for an alteration of the party policy with the clear-

cut and traditional will of the leaders of the party to continue serving the interests of French finance capital. Under the circumstances, therefore, it was really an achievement to fob off the members of the party with a resolution of such unusual ambiguity that even the "Temps," the organ of the Comité des Forges, could declare that "it revealed no disagreement with the views of Doumergue as to the aim to be achieved." This aim is, as we know, the introduction of fascism into the State machinery and the preparation for an open fascist dictatorship.

It was no mean achievement, because the masses of the members of the Radical Party are poor and middle peasants who are being ruined by the economic crisis, small traders and artisans who are being crushed by the weight of taxation and debt, subordinate officials who are being hit by the reduction of their already miserably poor salaries, backward workers whose impoverishment is increasing from day to day; in other words, middle strata of society who were bitterly disappointed with the bankruptcy of the left-wing parties in 1932 to 1934, and who want to have nothing to do with fascism and war, masses who are already beginning to show a desire to find another way out of the crisis and who are becoming gradually more and more restless.

One quarter of the district associations of the party had declared themselves against the continuation of the political truce, and only three or four had declared their approval of the truce without reservation. Most of the remaining associations had

expressed serious doubts as to the desirability of continuing the truce. A few days before the congress opened the senators of the Radical Party had announced their opposition to Doumergue's proposals for State reform, and this resistance had awakened great hopes in the broad masses under the influence of the Radical Party.

The Radical Party has a peculiar form of organisation. It is unable to say how many members it really has, and it is still less able to say how many of them really pay their contributions regularly. The committees of the lower organisations of the party are weak and practically without political life, and their opinion is never sought on any point of party policy. The delegates who appear at the district and national congresses have no clear mandate from anyone in particular, and in any case they are swamped by a huge mass of "ex officio" delegates, deputies, local officials, members of local governmental bodies and professional politicians of all sorts. The masses of the members of the Radical Party must kick up a tremendous hubbub before their voices are heard at the congress of the party.

However, even at this congress numerous speeches represented an oblique and very much weakened reflection of the discontent and irritation of the members of the party: "We Republicans will not let ourselves be intimidated with the bogey of rebellion. . . ." "These proposals represent a cloaked dictatorship. . . . Why has our parliamentary fraction failed to carry out the decision of the congress of Clermont-Ferrand, which demanded the disarming of the fascist gangs? . . . Down with the reactionaries!" These are one or two of the challenges which produced storms of applause. Numerous delegates pointed out that the government of National Union had aggravated the crisis instead of diminishing it. One of the delegates even inquired whether the leadership of the party had already abandoned the traditional slogan of the party: "We have no enemy on the left!" Another delegate touched on an uncomfortable question which is troubling the whole party when he asked: "We should like to know who are the real radicals; those who formed a block with the reactionaries at the recent elections, or those who sought a rapprochement with the left-wing united front?"

The prominent leaders of the party had to do without the storms of applause and lionising to which they had been accustomed at all other congresses. They received a vote of confidence and a decision which gives the Radical Ministers of the Cabinet considerable elbow room with the government of National Union, but these decisions were not taken without warning voices sounding and expressing to a certain extent the feelings of the members. **Guernut**, the leader of the League for Human Rights, and **Gaston Martin**, a high official of the Freemasons, both expressed the fear that **Herriot** and his friends might give way all too easily to the wishes of big capital. The reading of the passages in the resolution which referred to the confidence of the party in its leadership and in its parliamentary representatives were productive of a number of energetic shouts of "No!" which were, however, immediately countered by the traditional claque which surrounds the platform.

The unrest and the dissatisfaction in the Radical Party have not been allayed as the result of the congress. During the last day or two of the congress little groups of delegates could be observed in the corridors anxiously discussing the contents of the resolutions, and asking themselves what the formulation chosen actually meant, and whether they really offered a safeguard to the "democratic freedoms" to which the masses of the party members attached so much importance. In particular the simple delegates were dissatisfied with the very short length of time granted by the congress leadership for the discussion of economic and social questions, and in particular with the emptiness of the proposals which pretended to offer a solution of the unemployment problem, the agricultural crisis, the excesses of the economy emergency decrees, and the far-reaching disorganisation of French foreign trade.

In all these questions, which were hurriedly glossed over, the congress displayed an extreme poverty of ideas. High hopes had been placed on **Daladier**, who was to put forward new plans for economic reform, but he disappointed the delegates greatly with an involved and confused speech about inflation and paper money, which he declared lost a proportion of its value every year. The resolutions which were adopted and the speech of the Radical Minister for Agriculture in Doumergue's Cabinet (**Queuille**), re-

vealed the absolute incapacity of the bourgeoisie to do anything effective to master the economic crisis, and they will produce tremendous dissatisfaction in the ranks of the party, and particularly amongst the peasant supporters of the party.

Where is the Radical Party drifting? was the question which was on the lips of all the congress delegates. The question was not answered by the debates which took place at the Nantes congress. The maintenance of the political truce means nothing at all. There is no political truce. On the one hand there is the growth of fascism in the State machinery, the intensifying attack on the democratic freedoms of the workers and peasants, and the feverish preparations of the armed fascist bands encouraged by the authorities, and on the other hand there is the proletarian Socialist-Communist united front which is growing stronger and organising its activities more systematically. On which side of the barricades will the middle class in France find itself? It occupies a big, perhaps a decisive position in the country.

Herriot and his clique want to harness the middle class to the waggon of finance-capital, which is rapidly becoming more and more fascist and whose policy is deliberately preparing the way for fascism in France. Not for one moment, however, did the organisers of the congress point out the danger of fascism, but they did send forward **Georges Bonnet** to attack the proletarian united front, and to declare that those who refused to subscribe to the defence of the Fatherland and aimed at the establishment of Soviets had no programme acceptable to the Radicals. **Daladier** and the former young Republicans contented themselves with preaching the gathering of all republicans around the banner of the Radical Party. The declaration of the Nantes congress asserts that the party is prepared to work with "all progressive elements." The aim of this declaration is clearly to prepare the way for the acceptance of the invitation of the **Democratic Alliance** led by **Flandin**, the party of the right-wing centre, which aims at the formation of a centrist third party.

This "concentration" without a programme is intended to persuade the French middle class that it can play an independent political role, and to nourish dangerous illusions amongst the middle class as to its strength of resistance to fascism. It is now the task of the Communists to convince the disappointed masses of the members of the Radical Party that the manoeuvres of various pseudo-radical leaders will lead in the last resort to the same result as the open treacheries of **Herriot**, and that the radical masses must choose now between the fascist front and the united anti-fascist front of the masses of the people without necessarily first coming to a definite agreement about the final aim.

The co-ordination committee of the French Socialist Party and Communist Party is at present drawing up a clear programme of minimal demands, in accordance with the needs of the various social strata which are exploited by capitalism. These demands will also concern themselves with the needs of the middle class. In its persistent struggle against sectarianism the French Communist Party has already succeeded in approaching broad middle class elements instead of antagonising them, but it must do still more in order to save these middle-class elements from falling victim to fascism. At a meeting which took place in Nantes on the eve of the Radical Party Congress the secretary of the French Communist Party, **Thorez**, declared in the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party:—

"The Communist Party is prepared to support every real effort for the maintenance of the democratic liberties and against the development of fascism on any field whatsoever, including parliament."

These words must be made known to the masses of the Radical Party everywhere. Even at the congress itself there was a certain latent opposition against the capitulation policy of the leaders of the Radical Party, and there will be plenty of opportunity to approach the radical masses. **Herriot** will now negotiate with **Doumergue** and **Tardieu**, in order to secure, at least in appearances, a toning down of their fascist plans. The orders of the February 6 circle, who observes that the proletarian united front is growing stronger, will become more and more urgent, and the pressure will increase to such an extent that under the pretext of avoiding civil war the Radical Ministers will break through the frail barriers against further compromises which the Nantes congress was compelled to erect in order not to aggravate the dissatisfaction and discontent of the rank and file. The economic situation of the middle class is growing steadily worse and will

continue to do so, and therefore the middle class will begin to look around for real allies in its struggle against its impoverishment.

The honest democrats who strenuously oppose the "pinchbeck dictators" and the development to fascism, and who, although they oppose the slogan of the Soviets have been deeply impressed by the speech of *Pierre Cot*, in praise of the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and its growing strength and consolidation, will realise that their real place is in the broad united front of the toiling masses if the Communists know how to support their urgent demands and their struggle. The Nantes congress with its deliberate ambiguity will not have the same satisfying and soothing effect on them as it has had on the "Temps" and the other organs of French finance capital.

Politics

Foreign Political Review of the Week

"The purpose of the preliminary talks is to make it possible for the Conference to be held. . . . It is as necessary as it is difficult to decide whether every hypothesis can be entertained at the Conference itself without irretrievably prejudicing the prospect of signing another Treaty."

With these lines the "Times" of October 23 introduced the conversations which have commenced in London between the Japanese, English and American naval experts. On the following day the standpoint of the Japanese Admiralty, which, of course, was already known, was officially announced. Japan demands that the provisions of the Washington agreement of 1922 and of the London agreement of 1930, which laid down 5:5:3 as the ratio of the naval strength of England, America and Japan respectively, shall not remain in force and that Japan shall be placed on a footing of complete equality with other naval powers, for the national prestige of Japan could not permit it to occupy a secondary position any longer. It is no wonder, therefore, that immediately after the commencement of the London conversations great pessimism prevailed, which at such conversations, which aim at throwing dust in the eyes of the people, usually arises only later.

This pessimism, however, is only too well founded. The demand for equality is not even the most important demand put forward by Japan, or more correctly stated Japan's demands go far beyond the demand for equality. Japan is demanding the abolition of all aircraft-carriers, the abolition of capital ships and all cruisers which are reckoned as belonging to the "A" class in the London Treaty, that is to say, which carry guns of more than 6.1 in. calibre. The number of smaller cruisers are to be distributed equally. Regarding the remaining units, such as submarines, torpedo-boat destroyers, etc., a certain tonnage is to be fixed for them, but the three Powers will be free to distribute this tonnage as each desires among the three types of vessel. The meaning of this demand is, firstly, as England and America have warships with a great radius of action, by excluding these vessels the Japanese fleet would immediately advance to the first place. Secondly, however, and this is still more important, by excluding aircraft-carriers as well as ocean monsters with a wide range of action, the whole of the Eastern portion of the Pacific Ocean would be delivered over to Japan. For the rest, Japan announces quite openly that it puts forward these demands only in order to secure its interests on the Asiatic Continent.

In the meantime, in spite of all this, there does not appear to be any immediately threatening danger. The Washington and London naval agreement does not expire until the end of 1936. Notice to terminate this agreement must be given by the end of this year, otherwise it remains still longer in force. Japan will certainly give notice to terminate the agreement; but two and a half years, the time which the Treaty has still to run, is certainly a long time. By that time . . . As if the danger lies simply and solely in the dispute over the question of relative naval strength and not in the tremendously intensified imperialist antagonisms, which daily produce fresh tension and accordingly fresh collisions, which can lead to warlike complications, not in 1937, but even in the present year! The sharpening of the naval dispute is, in fact, itself only a consequence of the increased imperialist antagonisms. It is not due to chance that whilst the Admirals sit together at the same table in London, the American and English diplomats in Tokyo submit Notes protesting against the monopolisation of the sale of oil in Manchuria, this latest move of

Japanese imperialism, whereby the rights of the English and American oil traders are restricted. In the language of diplomacy, however, this is described as: "Violation of the principle of the open door in China" to which Manchuria also is pledged. We see, therefore, how the situation is becoming more threatening every day.

It is true, for the moment, the situation in Central and South-Eastern Europe is even more threatening than it is in the Far East. In the declaration of the Yugoslavian government it is stated:—

"The government will take good care that the crime of Marseilles is completely cleared up and the full responsibility for the crime ascertained, that all sanctions are employed."

Thus the fatal word "sanctions" is used. In fact weight is added to it by the passage:—

"Powerfully united at home, secured and respected abroad, well prepared from the military standpoint, we can calmly face the future."

If words have any meaning, this passage contains serious threats. It is known that intrigues were carried on in Hungary, the Prime Minister of which is the same M. Goemboes who, in his villa in *Nagy-Teteny* near Budapest, for months sheltered *Schultz* and *Tillesen*, the murderers of *Erzberger*. When, however, the declaration of the Yugoslavian government presumes to put forward its demands for sanctions not only in its own interests but also in the name of civilisation, then, of course, it is going too far. The Yugoslavian government forgets that not so long ago it set up a monument in *Serajevo* to the Bosnian *Princip*, and had it blessed by the highest clergy. Finally, *Princip* was not a holy man who would never have hurt a fly, but the man who shot down Archduke *Ferdinand* of *Habsburg* and his wife.

For the whole trouble is that things repeat themselves, even if, under the same conditions of imperialism, the actors change their roles. It must not come to a second *Serajevo* and it will not come to a second *Serajevo*, precisely because the world has drawn the lessons from *Serajevo*! That sounds very fine, but it is hardly in accordance with the facts. The Czechs fought against Austria for decades, then they themselves set up a small Austria. The Serbian nationalists, by means of individual terror, removed their own and foreign inconvenient rulers, and thereby made themselves the object of the hatred of official Austria-Hungary, which did not wish to be hindered in oppressing foreign nations. Conscious of its military superiority, and in the name of "civilisation," it made war on Serbia. At that time Austria-Hungary was sated; to-day it is Serbia that is sated, and therefore speaks in the name of "civilisation," awaits the results of the judicial investigation, brings fresh accusations every day against Hungary (thus the *Belgrade* press reveals the case of the Croat *Servati*, who, it is alleged, had knowledge of the complicity of the Hungarian government in the terrorist actions, and has been murdered in a military prison in *Budapest* and his body sunk in the *Danube*) and, worst of all, refers openly to its military preparedness and threatens with sanctions!

Goemboes wants to parry the blow. He is touring Europe. Yesterday he was in *Warsaw*, to-morrow or the day after he will visit *Schuschnigg* and *Mussolini*. *Schuschnigg* is hostile to Yugoslavia, which is giving shelter to the national socialists who took part in the insurrection of July 25. As an ardent supporter of the *Habsburgs* he dreams of the re-incorporation of Catholic Croatia in a restored *Habsburg* empire. The main reason, however, why *Schuschnigg* is opposed to Yugoslavia is because he is the vassal of *Mussolini*. *Mussolini*—he is the real saviour who even gave hospitality to the *Ustachi* and holds a protecting hand over *Pavelich* and *Kvaternik*. To proceed against Hungary, which is supported by Poland and Italy, and also by Austria, is no easy matter, especially if these Powers are actually behind Hungary, which, however, is far from being the case.

French influence is feverishly at work both in *Vienna* and in *Rome*. In *Vienna* its task is relatively easy. The authoritarian State is in need of money. The maintenance of the *Heimwehr* troops costs money. France has money. *Rome* also needs money. But in addition to money, *Mussolini* needs prestige. It has been really striking how frantically the Abyssinian government of late has opposed the accusations which were formerly raised by the Italian press. It protests against the accusation that it is arming excessively, that it has allowed the country to be overrun by Japanese. There are only three Japanese in the whole country, who are carrying on retail trade in *Addis-Ababa*. What is the

reason of these energetic denials? The Abyssinian government obviously knows more about the negotiations between France and Italy than the "Echo de Paris," the paper of the French General Staff, recently divulged when it stated that France was prepared to make concessions to Mussolini in Africa provided Mussolini changed his attitude to Yugoslavia. It is true, Mussolini has concluded a military alliance with Hungary, and fidelity to allies is a fine thing. The Hungarian press, the Hungarian poets sang their songs about this when, in the beautiful month of May, 1915, Italy, one of the parties to the Triple Alliance, betrayed its allies, the Habsburg monarchy, and entered the war on the side of the Entente. In Hungary it will not be necessary to write new songs, but merely reprint the old ones.

No matter how things shape, one thing is certain: the situation in South-East Europe is pregnant with fatal events. All these symptoms of crisis arise from the tremendous crisis of the whole capitalist system, from which there is only one way out, which the Russian proletariat, 17 years ago, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, adopted and followed victoriously to the end. As a result of this victory, however, we have the prospect of achieving the proletarian revolution without war, if only we bring to the knowledge of all toilers the tremendous achievements of Socialism in the Soviet Union, if we, just as the Bolsheviks did, conduct a determined, persistent fight against exploitation and oppression and build up a strong power as leader of the fight.

The Soviet Union needs time, and so also do we. In order to gain this time we must closely link up our fight for the right of self-determination of the nations, for the emancipation of the peoples from the yoke of capitalism, with the Soviet Union's fight for peace. If, as part of the large-scale fight, we conduct the fight for the daily needs of the working masses, in the fight against all imperialist warmongers direct the main fire against the present war adventurers, and conduct a daily, hourly fight to win the confidence of the toilers of all countries, then, instead of a world slaughter, we shall experience a world October.

The Responsibility of Fascist Germany for the Marseilles Assassinations

By Obarov

The more the analysis of the Marseilles assassinations goes into details—the assassinations which the Croat and national fascist organisation "Ustachi" and the Inner Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (Imro) carried out through its member, Kelemen, alias Tchernoshemski, the more clearly one sees what game was played behind the scenes of the assassinations and the more obvious becomes the responsibility of those who made it possible and supported it.

It is known that the leader of the organisation "Ustachi" (insurgents), Dr. Ante Pavelich, the actual organiser of the Marseilles assassinations, emigrated from Yugoslavia at the beginning of 1929. In the same year in which he succeeded in finally organising the "Ustachi" and forming centres of this organisation in Italy and Hungary, Pavelich went to Sofia. The purpose of this journey was to establish connections with the I.M.R.O., led by Michaelov, and to conclude a pact of friendship with it.

After the fascists came into power in Germany, however, the leaders of the Ustachi felt more at home in Munich and Berlin and therefore settled down in Germany. Their newspapers appeared here and here their members had the most freedom.

The ideology and the tactics of the terrorist organisation of the Croat Ustachi are thoroughly fascist and identical with those of Hitler fascism. Pavelich's programme consists in separating Croatia from Yugoslavia and setting up Croat fascism in place of Pan-Serbian fascism. In addition to assassinations, which the Ustachi propagate as a means of fight, it propagates anti-Marxism and combats proletarian internationalism. The leaders of the Ustachi are also great anti-semites.

In everything they imitate and propagate the policy of fascist Germany. Thus, after the heroic February fight of the Austrian proletariat, the central organ of the Ustachi, "Nesavisna Hrvatska Drjava" (Independent Croatian State), wrote in its issue of April 1, 1934:—

"The national socialists in Austria carry out the policy of Germany, and that does not please the Little Entente and France, who are afraid of the Anschluss. . . . Has the Austrian proletariat any real interest in sacrificing its life for the sake of the imperialist aims of French, Czech, Serb-Jewish capitalism?"

But the Marseilles assassinations and also the numerous outrages which the national-fascist Ustachi committed in Croatia show that this organisation does not confine itself to propaganda, but above all employs individual terror.

It required only a few weeks for the threats which the "Nesavisna Hrvatska Drjava" uttered on August 15 last against the French Foreign Minister Barthou and King Alexander to be realised in Marseilles. That which Pavelich's organ wrote in Berlin regarding Barthou and King Alexander were not mere words. It said:—

"They cannot play with other nations as they like. Fate will soon convince them of this."

What these words meant was seen on October 9 in Marseilles, when Kelemen-Tchernoshemski, who in 1924 murdered the Communist deputy Dimo Hadji Dimov in Sofia, assassinated King Alexander and Barthou.

Whilst the outrages were being prepared in Munich and Berlin, the "Nesavisna Hrvatska Drjava" in its issue of August 16, in its comments on the bloody events of June 30 and the "second revolution" in Germany, wrote in the most flattering terms of the Hitler regime:—

"Hitler has shown once again that not only can he enthuse and organise a people numbering nearly 100,000,000 souls, but that he is also capable at any moment and under the most difficult conditions of holding this State in his hands and, as it should be, being not only the leader of this people, but, with the will and approval of the population, also the master."

The "Nesavisna Hrvatska Drjava" is not content with accusing the French government and Barthou of having favoured the preparations of a "second revolution" in Germany, but it concludes the article with the following threats:—

"Even if the hopes of M. Barthou have been partly fulfilled, it still remains a big question who will have saved his head by these complications."

This attitude of the Croat terrorist organisation to the events of June 30 caused the Paris daily paper "Excelsior" to remark that it was the same attitude as that expressed in the circular Herr Rosenberg sent to his friends abroad after the leaders of the "second revolution" had been put out of the way. "Excelsior" was constrained to put the question:—

"Is not this organisation of Croat terrorists just as dependent on Rosenberg as the terrorist Ukrainian Konovaltz organisation is?"

The more closely the Marseilles assassination is investigated the more apparent becomes the responsibility of the German fascists for this assassination.

We will not draw up a list of the terrorist actions carried out by the Ustachi since it was founded in 1929. We will only state that, during the trial of members of the Ustachi it was repeatedly established that infernal machines in the trains proceeding to Yugoslavia were placed in the railway waggons not only on Yugoslavian territory, but also in Munich. Thus an infernal machine was placed in a compartment of the Zagreb express in January last. The infernal machine exploded in Brechitza (Croatia), blowing the compartment to pieces and killing several people. The Ustachi organisation thought that the Foreign Ministers of the Little Entente, Benes, Titulescu and Jefitch, who were proceeding to a Conference of the Little Entente in Zagreb, would occupy this compartment.

The Ministers of the Little Entente escaped only because they happened not to be in the compartment which was blown up. Herr Rosenberg's organ, the "B. Z. am Mittag," commented on this outrage with the following prophetic words:—

"The outrages which have been committed several times on Yugoslavian railway trains will not cease."

Encouraged by similar prophetic words of friends of Rosenberg, the "Nesavisna Hrvatska Drjava" of February 16 last declared:—

"If the three Ministers had been blown up nobody could rightly blame the Croats, as one cannot deny anybody the right of self-defence, and Benes, Titulescu and Jefitch are those who have provoked and attacked and have no business in our Croat Zagreb."

That it was possible for a paper appearing in Germany to write in such a manner, that it was also possible for terrorists in Germany to plan assassinations, shows that the terrorist Ustachi had very, very influential protectors in Germany.

The Ustachi Croat national fascists and the terrorists of the

I.M.R.O. are to be found in all fascist countries, but they are accorded the most friendly treatment in Germany. Thus they could carry on their conspiratorial activity in Germany undisturbed, and therefore the assassins and organisers of the assassinations in Marseilles met on September 28 in Munich. In this town Kelemen-Tchernoshemski, Kvaternik and Pospichil and the rest of them were able to prepare their plans in peace.

The more light that is thrown on the Marseilles assassinations the greater appears the responsibility of the leaders of fascist Germany.

The Assassinations in Marseilles and the Movement for Macedonian Freedom

By D. Vlachov

On October 9 a successful attempt was made on the life of *Alexander Karageorgivitch*, the King of Yugoslavia. This attempt was made with deliberately provocative aims. The French Foreign Minister, *Barthou*, was also fatally wounded by the bullets of the assassins.

The assassin, who was killed on the spot by police and military, was first known under the name of Petrus Kelemen-Suk, but later it became known that he was identified with *Vlado Georgiev Tchernosemski*, a notorious murderer and a member of the fascist band led by *Ivan Michailov*.

Who were his aiders and abettors? They were a number of terrorists from the Croat fascist organisation *Pavelitch-Pertchetch*.

It is well known that close connections have been maintained between the Pavelitch organisation and that of Michailov for many years. Five years ago these relations were cemented in an agreement drawn up with the full knowledge and the approval of the government of Bulgaria and of the King of Bulgaria, Boris, in Sofia. The agreement was signed on the one hand by *Pavelitch* and *Pertchetch*, and on the other hand by *Dr. Stanitchev* and the fascist deputy in the Bulgarian parliament, *V. Vassiliev*.

The fact that Vlado Georgiev Tchernosemski, notorious as the murderer of the great Macedonian revolutionary and Communist deputy in the Bulgarian Parliament, *Dimo Hadshi Dimov*, and of many other Macedonian revolutionaries, took a leading part in the assassination of King Alexander demonstrates how close are the relations existing between the two organisations. As an experienced terrorist Tchernosemski was attached by his leader Michailov to the organisation of Pavelitch in order to assist in the terrorist actions of the latter body.

It is well known that both organisations have the same aim, that they support each other on all fields both politically and materially, and that they are both in the service of international fascism. Both organisations work for Mussolini, Horthy, Hitler and King Boris of Bulgaria.

Like all the other innumerable acts of terrorism committed by these two fascist organisations in recent years, the assassinations in Marseilles had their roots in present-day Yugoslavia, one of the fruits of the Versailles system, in which nine million Croats, Slovenians, Macedonians, Albanians, Montenegrins and other national minorities out of a total population of 14 millions are compelled to live under the bloody regime established by the Pan-Serbian fascist military dictatorship. After the two Balkan wars the territory of Serbia became almost twice as large as it had been before. Serbia seized by violence a great portion of Macedonia, the whole of Kosovo and parts of other territories. Macedonians, Albanians and Turks were made subject to Serbian rule. After the world war the territory of Serbia extended to 271,000 square kilometres and its population rose from 4,550,000 to 14 millions. At first called the Kingdom of the Serbians, Croats and Slovenians, it was afterwards termed Yugoslavia. Apart from the nationalities which had already been subjugated, the Croats, Slovenians, Montenegrins, Dalmatians, Bosniaks, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Germans and Magyars were forced under Serbian sway.

Yugoslavia is suffering from a severe economic crisis. The measures taken by the military-fascist dictatorship seek to place all the burdens of the crisis on to the shoulders of the working people and above all on the shoulders of the oppressed nationalities. The poor peasants did not receive the land which was promised them, and instead the large estates which were confiscated from the Turks and others went over into the hands of new Pashas, the servants of the new regime, Ministers, generals and deputies. The various strata of the working people of Yugoslavia, the workers and peasants, the artisans and small traders, and the

intellectuals who sympathise with the people, are treated like colonial or semi-colonial masses and they live under almost unbelievable circumstances of poverty and misery. Hunger is prevalent throughout Yugoslavia. All the sections of the working people are in a ferment of discontent.

Parallel with an almost intolerable system of economic exploitation there is a system of military and police dictatorship which aims at throttling the revolutionary movement. The police terror is unbridled. The arbitrary administration in the courts of law is supplemented by the arbitrary ruthlessness of the police. Mass arrests and searches, murder without due process of law and without sentence, innumerable cases of prisoners "disappearing without trace" whilst in the hands of the police, innumerable cases of prisoners being "shot whilst attempting to escape," etc., are everyday phenomena. The prison system is designed to exterminate physically the prisoners handed over to it. The prisons of *Glavnyatcha*, *Stremaska-Mitrovitzka* and *Lepa Glava* are modern Bastilles.

Since the establishment of Serbian rule in Macedonia and Kosovo over 30,000 Albanian workers and peasants and over 1,500 Macedonian workers and peasants have been slaughtered. Hundreds of villages have been pounded to pieces by artillery. One hundred thousand Macedonians have passed through the prisons of Serbian imperialism and 3,500 of them have been sentenced to a total of over 10,000 years of imprisonment. One hundred thousand Albanians, 100,000 Turks and 50,000 Macedonians have been driven out of the country and their land has been confiscated.

The following is an incomplete balance of the police terror since the establishment of the fascist military dictatorship: From January 6, 1929, to January 17, 1934, 285 political trials took place; 1,278 revolutionaries were sentenced to a total imprisonment of 3,468 years; ten revolutionaries were sentenced to imprisonment for life; 15 revolutionaries were sentenced to death, whilst 140 Communists, national revolutionaries and other opponents of the Serbian regime were murdered without trial whilst in the hands of the police. At the present moment there are over 10,000 political prisoners in Serbian prisons under an almost intolerable prison regime. The hunger strike carried out by 196 political prisoners in *Mitrovitzka* about ten months ago gave public opinion some idea of the nature of the Serbian prison regime.

The masses of the people in Yugoslavia have been robbed of all political rights, whilst the national minorities have not merely none of the ordinary political rights, but they have also been robbed, either completely or in part, of their national and cultural rights. The Macedonians are even forbidden to speak their own language.

Many opponents of the brutal Pan-Serbian regime have been unable to win their way forward to a broader revolutionary political outlook and they are strongly under the influence of the individual terrorist traditions attaching to the struggles of national minorities for their freedom. The terrorists who carried out the Marseilles assassinations are such elements. Amongst the members of terrorist groups inside and outside of Yugoslavia there are undoubtedly many men who honestly believe that they can further the struggle against their oppressors and help to free their own people by the use of individual terrorism.

These men are wholly wrong. Individual terrorist actions undertaken without any connection with mass uprisings of the people have never facilitated the tasks of any revolutionary movement; on the contrary, they have invariably made its task more difficult and hindered its development.

On the other hand, those imperialist and fascist States whose interests are contrary to those of Pan-Serbian imperialism deliberately exploit the internal situation in Yugoslavia to further their own ends. These States have supported the terrorists and offered them asylum. They have provided them with funds, arms, munitions, forged passports, etc., and they have founded camps in which these terrorists are trained for their murderous work under the supervision of official military representatives of the State in question. It has been proved to the hilt that Italy, Hungary, Germany and Bulgaria, all fascist countries, have supported the terrorist organisations of Michailov and Pavelitch.

For many years Michailov and his organisation have been in the pay of Bulgarian fascism. They have played the role of executioner against the Bulgarian and Macedonian people. They have organised banditry and terrorism in favour of Italy and Bulgaria on Yugoslavian and Greek territory, and these actions were of an

openly provocative character against the Macedonian people and its national-revolutionary struggle for freedom.

The assassinations in Marseilles were carried out at the behest of international fascism which has every interest in causing complications in Europe at the present moment and provoking a new imperialist war.

Michailov's chief activity consisted in the organisation of terrorist crimes against prominent persons, public buildings, etc., of the Pan-Serbian military-fascist dictatorship. At the moment Michailov himself is in disgrace with the fascist-military dictatorship in Bulgaria and his place has been taken by *Shandalov*, the leader of the other wing of the Macedonian fascist organisation. Michailov has also carried out terrorist activity in that part of Macedonia which is under Greek rule, but such actions were less frequent. His chief activity was the extermination of the opponents of his paymaster, Bulgarian fascism, and this task is still being performed energetically. Michailov and his bands have murdered no less than 2,500 anti-fascist and anti-imperialist Macedonians in the *Petritch* district and in other parts of Bulgaria, and they have also taken an active part in the slaughter of Bulgarian workers and peasants organised by Bulgarian fascism.

Individual terrorism brings grist to the mill of the reaction even if such terrorism is conducted with the most unselfish motives. This has been proved sufficiently by the history of the Macedonian struggle for national freedom both under the rule of the Sultans and under the rule of its present-day oppressors. For instance, the attempt made on the life of *General Kovatchevitch*, the military commandant of Schtip in 1927, resulted in the slaughter of several hundred workers, peasants and intellectuals and in a frightful reign of terror, both moral and physical, against the whole population. The answer of the Pan-Serbian dictatorship to an armed attack made in 1923 on a village in the *Radovitch* district, in which Serbian colonists had settled, was the summary execution of 29 peasants from the village of Karvan in the same district. Individual terrorism further paralyses the activity of the masses and condemns them to passivity.

Very often such individual terrorist methods are used provocatively by the oppressors themselves in order to provide them with an excuse for further oppression. For instance, in 1928, the fascist deputy *Punitcha Rakitch*, acting under the instructions of Alexander Georgivitch himself, murdered *Stepan Raditch*, the leader of the Croat Peasant Party, his nephew *Pavel Raditch* and the Croat leader *Bassaritch*, in a session of the Yugoslavian Skupchina of which all three were deputies. This slaughter served as the pretext for the establishment of the military-fascist dictatorship in Yugoslavia.

In 1924 the Bulgarian government Tzankoff-Volkov organised the assassination of the Macedonian fascist *Todor Alexandrov* and then accused the Bulgarian Communists and Macedonian revolutionaries of the crime. The vile provocation was then taken as a pretext for the slaughter of 200 revolutionary Macedonians and for the organisation of a frightful wave of terror against the Bulgarian Communist movement and against the Macedonian national revolutionary movement.

As a result of these facts the Macedonian masses have recognised the mistakes of the past and the fatal effects the individual terrorist actions have had on the development of their movement for national freedom, and the overwhelming majority has turned away from the perpetrators of such actions. The overwhelming majority of the Macedonian people is convinced that its freedom can be won only in mass action in concert with all the other victims of oppression and exploitation in Yugoslavia, Greece and Bulgaria, the three countries which oppress Macedonia, and with the victims of oppression and exploitation all over the world. The masses in Macedonia are therefore rallying more and more around their real organisation, the *United Inner Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation* (I.M.R.O.) which is working for the overthrow of oppression by means of a mass insurrection, for the right of self-determination for the Macedonian people, for the secession of Macedonia and for the establishment of an independent republic of the working people.

The Socialist Party in Porto Rico

"The socialists cannot reach their great aim without fighting against every form of national oppression. They must, therefore, unequivocally demand that the social democrats of the oppressing countries (of the so-called "great" nations in particular) should recognise and defend the right of the oppressed nations to self-determination in the political sense of the word, that is, the right to political separation. A socialist of a great nation or a nation possessing colonies who does not defend this right is a chauvinist."

Lenin and Zinoviev.

By Samuel Weinman

More than a year ago (March 25, 1933) the socialist weekly in New York, the "*New Leader*," in an article by H. J. Cox, exulted.

"Nowhere under the Stars and Stripes is socialism making so great an advance as in Porto Rico."

What happened at that time to throw the socialist "*New Leader*" into ecstasies over Porto Rico? It appears that the cause of all the rejoicing was the fact that the election results installed a large number of socialists in political offices, including *Santiago Iglesias*, Resident Commissioner, and leader of the Porto Rican Socialist Party, seven out of nineteen senators, thirteen out of thirty-nine members of the assembly and a dozen mayors.

The Socialist Party had entered into a coalition with the Union Republican Party. The socialists alone polled over 97,000 votes, but the coalition vote exceeded 208,000, compared with 170,000 for the liberals. On the basis of the election returns the "*New Leader*" hastened to herald the "great advance of socialism."

Let us see further what is the programme of the Socialist Party of Porto Rico. Shortly following the elections *Santiago Iglesias* wrote in the "*New Leader*" (February 4, 1933) about "fundamental changes," but he made himself clear, declaring:—

"These changes will be obtained only by legislative measures and the organisation of the workingmen."

Iglesias and the rest of the Socialist leadership have logically combined theory with practice by acting as the chief strike breakers for the sugar, fruit and tobacco imperialists of Wall Street. Strike smashing is the only reason for the existence of the Mediation and Conciliation Service, a sub-division of the Bureau of Labour. Commissioner of Labour *Martinez*, also a socialist, ordinarily supervises the strike sell-outs himself, but when a ticklish situation arises *Iglesias* is always ready to lend a helping hand to the imperialists.

Here is how the sell-out scheme works. The socialist arbitrators force the workers to accept an agreement which chains them to their feudal conditions. For example, Article 9, of the agreement between the United Porto Rican Sugar Co., a Wall Street owned property, and its employees in nine towns provides:—

"In those cases in which difficulties arise between employers and employees, the labourers will not go on strike, nor will they quit work. When any difference occurs, they will negotiate an understanding with the employers, and if their efforts should be in vain they will apply to the Mediation and Conciliation Commission, so that it will go on procuring an agreement. Work will not be stopped while settlement negotiations are going on."

Martinez and *Iglesias* are directly responsible for the strike-breaking agreements. Yet Cox, in the same "*New Leader*" article, already referred to, had the nerve to write that *Martinez* "guards the rights of the workers."

The Socialist Party of Porto Rico recently issued a pamphlet from which the "*New York Times*" (September 4, 1934) quoted the following:—

"The influence of the American people (read Wall Street imperialism—S. W.) on Porto Rico has been, is and will continue to be a civilising process, and the extension of the Federal Constitution to the island represents a positive guarantee of political liberty favourable to the enjoyment of individual rights."

In other words, the Porto Ricans are a highly fortunate people, *Iglesias*, *Martinez* and company maintain, because Wall Street has chosen to take them to its bosom.

Is it true that Wall Street has exercised a "civilising" influence and guaranteed liberty and individual rights? Has the "socialism" that the "*New Leader*" raved about improved in the least the

living and working conditions of Porto Rican toilers? What exactly are the conditions of the workers and peasants?

In brief these are the facts: First, 650,000 Porto Ricans, or over 40 per cent. of the population, are completely unemployed. Chancellor Chardon, of the University of Porto Rico, admitted that 150,000 are permanently unemployed.

Second, the vast majority of those working, mainly part time, receive 5 cents an hour or less. The N.R.A. fixed wages in the needlework code at 5 dollars a week. General Johnson established wages in the infants' and children's wear industry at the rate of 2 dollars a week for home workers and three dollars for factory workers. New York manufacturers are sending cut garments to Porto Rico for sewing, finishing and embroidery. The sugar code provides for a twelve-hour day.

Third, unemployed relief amounts to 75 cents a week for families of three and one dollar a week extra for larger families, even those of ten or twelve.

Fourth, the cost of living in Porto Rico is 35 per cent. higher than in the United States. The "New York Times" reported that, thanks to the N.R.A., goods imported from the mainland will cost 18,000,000 dols. more this year than before the New Deal.

Fifth, starvation is an ordinary condition in Porto Rico. Workers and peasants eat little besides rotten rice and rotten beans. Often even these foods are entirely absent.

The Wall Street imperialists, on the other hand, hold a monopoly on the island's wealth, including the sugar, fruit and tobacco industries, as well as the public utilities. The bankers of Wall Street, led by the National City Bank, have squeezed enormous super-profits out of the island.

In the face of the impoverished state of Porto Rico's toiling masses the "New Leader" had the audacity to support Iglesias' pretensions to socialism.

Chancellor Chardon, imperialism's watch dog, has sounded a warning bark to the imperialists, stating that Porto Rico would be confronted with a major social catastrophe (revolution) within twenty years unless fundamental economic changes were undertaken.

Disillusionment of Iglesiasian "socialism" is spreading rapidly. In some sections of Porto Rico the Socialist Party has already begun to disintegrate. At the same time the Communist Party is gaining strength and influence by leading strikes, unemployed and anti-imperialist struggles. Only confiscation of the plantations, mills, factories and land can bring about a "fundamental change." The Communist Party of Porto Rico is forging that major social catastrophe, which will be a catastrophe only for the Wall Street bankers and the native exploiters. For the toilers it will spell emancipation.

United States

The Coming Elections in the U.S.A.

Letter from Washington

By W. R.

A series of important elections will take place in the United States on November 6. As always every two years the whole of the Congress and a third of the deputies to the Senate will be elected. Further, the governorship elections will be held in 35 of the Federal States.

The "primaries," that is to say, the party elections in which the representatives of the various parties chose the candidates to be put forward on behalf of their parties, have already taken place in all the Federal States. The result of the coming elections will decide in advance to a great extent the result of the Presidential election, which will take place again in 1936. The party in power in the United States can generally reckon on holding the position of President for another four years on behalf of its candidate if it succeeds in holding its positions in the previous elections to Congress and to the Senate. The loss of the Congressional and Senatorial elections by the Republican Party in 1930 was the preliminary step to the defeat of its candidate Hoover in the Presidential election in 1932.

The central point of the election campaign at present being conducted is of course Roosevelt's "New Deal" policy. In the main the struggle is being conducted as in the past in the United States between the two great bourgeois parties, the Republican Party, which is out of office, and the Democratic Party, which is in. The majority of the Democratic candidates—with the sole excep-

tion of a small minority of conservative elements—are taking their stand behind Roosevelt and his "New Deal." On the other hand, the majority of the Republican candidates are coming forward with severe criticism of the "New Deal." The chief slogan of the Republican Party, which was driven into the opposition by the unparalleled economic crisis after a period of office lasting twelve years, is directed against the bureaucratic State interference in economic life, against the tremendous growth of the public debt, and against "the regimentation of the people" by the State, which it declares is leading directly to the replacement of democracy by dictatorship and to "the terrible fate of such countries as Italy, Germany, and—the Soviet Union!"

However, these slogans are not proving very attractive amongst the broad masses of the American people. The Democratic Party, on the other hand, is promising the introduction of State insurance and repeating the much-boosted promise of Roosevelt that "no one in the United States shall suffer hunger."

Broad masses of the lower middle classes and of the working class are naturally disappointed with the results of the "New Deal," but first of all it is not the Republican Party which is acting as the vessel for the accumulation of this dissatisfaction; and, secondly, although it is directed against particular actions and measures of the government and against individual members of Cabinet, it is not directed against Roosevelt himself, whose personal authority is still very high in the various strata of American society. Roosevelt's clever manoeuvring is becoming increasingly difficult in face of the intensifying class contradictions, it is true, but he is still able to hold broad masses of the lower middle classes, a section of the working class and even those sections in whose consciousness a radical change has taken place.

The very considerable sums which have been paid out to the farmers by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the limitation of the sowings, for cattle breeding, and as relief for the victims of the drought have not failed to have their effect. Up to the present about 350 million dollars have been paid out and a further sum of 700 million dollars is still to be paid out, not to mention the various other ways in which the farmers are being assisted.

When one takes this into consideration and also the fact that support has also been given to the unemployed workers to a certain extent, even although that support was very parsimonious, it can be easily understood why the Republicans cannot reckon with much success; why, for instance, the book written by Hoover and published just before the elections with an eye to Republican propaganda, "The Challenge to Liberty," which defends "the old traditions of personal and constitutional liberty," has not had much success, and, finally, why the conservative publicist and friend of Hoover, Sullivan, points out quite openly that in the coming Congress "a moderate beginning" must be expected from the Right wing of the Democrats rather than from the Republicans themselves, as any considerable success for them at the coming elections is obviously out of the question.

The influential Democratic leader Alf Smith, who is leading the opposition within the Democratic Party, has summed up the prevailing mood of the American populace in the laconic words: "Who would kill Santa Claus just before Christmas?" Under these circumstances no one doubts that Roosevelt will be victorious. The only question which is still left open is the magnitude of the Democratic victory. The Democrats already have the majority in Congress. The defeat of Hoover gave them not only the Presidency but also a majority in both houses.

The Senate consists of 60 Democrats, 35 Republicans, and one member of the Farmer Labour Party. The third of the seats in the Senate which are now coming up for re-election are held by 13 Republicans, 4 "Progressive Republicans" (the "Left" wing of the petty-bourgeois Radicals who support the "New Deal"), one member of the Farmer Labour Party and 17 Democrats. In the Southern States the Democratic traditions are making themselves felt strongly and in a number of them the Republicans are not even bothering to put forward candidates at all. In this way the success of the Democrats in six States is already assured, and in addition there is the almost certain election of the Democratic candidates in New York State and Massachusetts. The election struggle is taking place chiefly in a number of the Eastern States which formerly had a Republican tradition, and in the farmer States of the West and Middle West.

The Democrats hope not only to hold their own positions but to win a number of further States away from the Republicans. It is not at all impossible that they will obtain a two-thirds majority in the Senate as a result of the coming elections, something which the Republicans never achieved even at the height of their power and influence. The Senate is the more important of the two houses because it ratifies agreements, etc., and possesses a great traditional political weight.

The Congress, unlike the Senate, is elected according to the population of each Federal State, whilst the Senate is composed of two representatives from each State irrespective of the population figures, thus giving the less thickly populated farmer States the upper hand of the States of the industrial East. The Congress has 313 Democratic members, 177 Republicans, and five members of the Farmer Labour Party. The Democrats also hope to maintain their positions in Congress as a result of the elections.

The election campaign is proceeding along the usual lines with the liberal use of the demagogy in which both bourgeois parties in the United States invariably indulge. The "New Deal" slogans of which the Secretary for Agriculture, Wallace, gives an illuminating variety in a book he has just published, entitled "New Boundaries," will hardly exercise much effect on the future policy of the government.

It is in fact more than likely that just the period after the elections will be the one chosen by big capital to take up a firmer line in all questions and to demand the carrying out of measures which have for the moment been postponed for reasons of political expediency: for instance, a firm line against strikes, the abandonment of the inflationist policy, the shifting of the burden of social support from the State to the sphere of private charity, the stabilisation of the currency, the balancing of the budget, the reduction of wages, and the further adaptation of the National Recovery Act to the demands of large-scale capital.

The background of the election campaign is formed by the tremendous economic crisis, an intensification of the dissatisfaction and disappointment of the broad masses of the people, increasing pressure on the part of large-scale capitalist interests, and a tremendous intensification of all class contradictions. The economic crisis touched its severest point in the spring of 1933, and, despite a relapse which has since occurred, the economic index is higher at the moment than it was when Roosevelt came to office. However, it is only now that the masses are beginning to realise the magnitude of the crisis, it is only now that they are beginning to realise more and more clearly that the tremendous catastrophe which has hit them has its roots in the nature of the prevailing system of society.

It is true that according to the statistics of the reformist **American Federation of Labour** there are no longer 13.5 million workers unemployed, as there were in March, 1933, but "only" 11 millions. The index of industrial production issued by the Federal Reserve Bank (1923-25=100) stands at from 71 to 73 instead of 60 in March, 1933, and it is true that the volume of employment in industry has increased, but within this "special sort of depression" which has taken the place of the crisis, there has already developed a particular cycle of "depression and prosperity." The biggest economic improvement took place in the summer of 1933 when, according to the same index, the figure was from 95 to 100, but after that the level dropped rapidly again.

It must also be taken into consideration that the rise in the prices of mass consumption commodities has already rendered all wage increases void, that the employers are still bitterly fighting against any recognition of the unions, and that the key branches of industry (those which produce the means of production) have not succeeded in struggling out of the crisis stage. It is therefore quite understandable that the masses are only beginning to realise the economic and social limits of the policy of "reconstruction and reform."

The general process of radicalisation which has taken place during the crisis was expressed clearly in the "Primaries," which began in September and ended in October. The "Primaries" showed an extraordinary growth of petty-bourgeois radicalism which occasionally threatened to break loose from the influence of Roosevelt and go beyond the slogans of the "New Deal." There is no question for the moment of any uniformity in this movement, no question of the formation of any "Third Party." In the past all efforts to form such a "Progressive Party" or "Farmer

Labour Party" have proved fruitless, and the organisations which were formed quickly collapsed under the blows of the Party machines of the two big bourgeois parties and as a result of their own lack of homogeneity.

The objective role at present being played by Roosevelt consists in taking the wind out of the sails of the various tendencies towards radicalism by means of demagogic phraseology, and he is, for the moment at least, keeping the radicalisation of the masses to a great extent within the channels of his own influence. In the election struggle which will take place in November it will be still the two old traditional parties of the American bourgeoisie which face each other.

Reorganisation of N.R.A.

By M. Morris (New York)

Recent developments in the N.R.A. can be understood only in relation to the significance of the entire "New Deal" as the precursor of fascism in the United States. The bourgeoisie, finding itself at the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933 in a catastrophic situation, backed Roosevelt on the basis of his "New Deal" programme, the main features of which had been worked out with their active participation long before he came into office.

One part of this programme involved a combination of inflating prices through the unorthodox method of direct devaluation, supporting through loans bankrupt financial and industrial corporations, and raising agricultural prices through crop reductions. The other part of the programme, later to be known as the N.I.R.A. (National Industrial Recovery Act), involved the stimulation of further development of monopolies through virtual revocation of the anti-trust laws and the institution of industrial codes of "fair competition" permitting price-fixing and production control, setting minimum wages at depression levels and fixing maximum hours. This entire programme was put across with the usual demagogy, promising "equal" benefits to the working class through the so-called "collective bargaining" of wage and hour provisions of the codes and the assurance to labour of its right to organise. Roosevelt was presented as a friend of labour and his New Deal, a "planned economy" to solve the crisis.

The National Industrial Recovery Act was the cornerstone of the "New Deal" since it not only dealt with the key questions of labour relations but also laid the foundation for the State machinery to bring about the desired semi-fascist organisation of industry and labour. For this reason the head of the N.R.A. (National Recovery Administration) was obviously the most important person in the entire "New Deal" with the exception of Roosevelt. **General Hugh S. Johnson**, with his experience in putting over the draft during the World War, his experience in demagogy, and his ability to bull-doze not only the workers but also those among the bourgeoisie who did not discern that Roosevelt's policies were to their own interests, was a wise choice. Under the influence of war-time psychology and ballyhoo propaganda of unexcelled proportions, he effected the initial setting up of the stupendous apparatus within an incredibly short period of time.

That the New Deal has been a success in promoting the interests of the big bourgeoisie at the expense of the broad masses of workers and farmers is clear to-day. According to Donald R. Richberg's report, August 26, 1934, "net profits of 402 industrial companies rose from 47,380,000 dollars in the first half of 1933 to 355,870,000 in the first half of 1934, an increase of over 600 per cent." On the other hand, the consumption of the necessities of life is less to-day than it was a year ago. Retail prices of food in September, 1934, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labour statistics, were 29 per cent. above those of April, 1933. Retail prices of clothing (Fairchild Index) in September were 27 per cent. above those of April, 1933. At the same time, the average weekly wages of workers in manufacturing industries as reported by the Bureau of Labour Statistics were in July, 1934, only 10.5 per cent. above those of April, 1933. Furthermore, according to the Federal Relief Administrator Hopkins, the number of people receiving Federal relief this winter will reach a new high record of 20,000,000.

This vicious attack of the N.R.A. upon the standard of living of the entire working class, together with the complete exposure of the emptiness of its promises by the strike-breaking activities of its various labour boards, has raised the class struggle to a new

level. This manifested itself in a new wave of strikes and militant struggles of national dimensions, such as the **San Francisco longshoremen's strike** and the more recent **national textile strike**. At the same time, the greatly improved financial position of the big bourgeoisie and their realisation of the benefits accruing to them through the whole New Deal programme leads them to more vigorous insistence upon "reforming" the N.R.A. to achieve two main tasks: (1) consolidation of the advantages gained by establishment of the permanent N.R.A. organisation more closely tied up with industrial and finance capital; and (2) complete suppression of the rapidly increasing struggles of the working class against the intensified exploitation under the N.R.A.

The achievement of this two-fold task required the change of N.R.A. from an emergency one-man organisation to one based on committees of leading capitalists and reactionary labour leaders. This meant the end of Johnson's usefulness as the N.R.A. whip. Also, his outspoken, vitriolic attacks on labour too openly exposed the strike-breaking role of N.R.A., contrary to the desired subtle demagoguery of the Administration and the A.F. of L. officialdom. As a consequence, Johnson was "quietly forced" out of the N.R.A. on September 29, 1934.

The reorganisation of N.R.A. embraced the revision of the **Industrial Emergency Committee**, established by executive order in June, 1934, so that it will now determine the broad policies of almost all of the "New Deal" agencies. It created the **Industrial Recovery Board** to replace Johnson as administrator of Article I. of N.R.A. (industrial codification). Both of these boards are directly responsible to Roosevelt.

The Industrial Emergency Committee will determine, "with the approval of the President," the general policies of the administration of N.R.A.; make recommendations concerning problems of relief, public works, labour disputes and industrial and agricultural recovery; and co-ordinate these activities. **Donald R. Richberg**, former railway labour lawyer and until now General Counsel for N.R.A., is chairman of this committee. Its other members are Secretary of Interior, Harry L. Ickes; Secretary of Labour, Frances Perkins; Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, Harry L. Hopkins; and Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, Chester C. Davis. That the appointment of Richberg as head of this body is in response to the demands of industrial and finance capitalists is indicated by the fact that as long ago as March, after the "field day for critics" (the convocation at Washington of Code Authority executives and so-called critics of N.R.A.), Kiplinger Letter, confidential news service to business men, summarised the opinions of employers as to desirable reorganisation of N.R.A. as follows: "To let Johnson retire a few months hence with glory, thanks and relief. . . . Men mentioned to succeed Johnson: Richberg, is Power No. 1 behind Johnson. Richberg has a partial grip on labour, a partial grip on industry, the two major competing forces within N.R.A."

The Industrial Recovery Board will execute the N.R.A., subject to the approval of the Industrial Emergency Committee. As chairman of this Board, Roosevelt appointed **S. Clay Williams**, former president and now vice-chairman of the Board of Directors of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, one of the three companies having a virtual monopoly of cigarette manufacturing in the United States. He has been active in N.R.A. circles since its early beginning, first as chairman of the Industrial Advisory Board and vice-chairman of the National Labour Board, and more recently as chairman of the Business Advisory and Planning Council for the Department of Commerce. Through his influence the cigarette companies are not yet operating under an N.R.A. code and his own company pays wages as low as five dollars and six dollars a week to Negro workers in its plants in Winston Salem, North Carolina.

Another member of the board, closely allied with monopoly capital, is **Arthur D. Whiteside**, president of Dun and Bradstreet and former N.R.A. Divisional Administrator who negotiated the retail and textile codes. His high favour with the capitalists is clearly indicated by the description of him as candidate for Johnson's place, in Kiplinger Letter, March 10, 1934: "Whiteside is Choice No. 1 of the industrialists. He's an excellent man, but labour isn't enthusiastic."

In addition to these two men, who, according to the New York **Herald-Tribune**, October 7, 1934, were "chosen as business men and conservatives," a third member of the board is Sidney Hill-

man, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and one of the most reactionary A.F. of L. leaders. Its other members are Leon C. Marshall, college professor, formerly member of the now defunct National Labour Board, and Walton H. Hamilton, professor of Constitutional Law at Yale University. Clearly it is a board designed to "administer" the N.R.A. in closest harmony with the interest of Wall Street finance and industrial capitalists to further the development of monopolies and cartels, while at the same time brutally suppressing all militant strike struggles of the workers against the intolerable conditions imposed on them by the N.R.A.

In one of his first statements, Donald R. Richberg, chairman of the Industrial Emergency Committee, insured the confidence of the big bourgeoisie in him by his exposition of the policy of the reorganised N.R.A. According to **Wall Street Journal**, October 10, 1934, the chief points of this statement were: (1) "Despite some unwise and uneconomical expenditures in the past nineteen months, the unemployed must be cared for through further outlays to prevent revolution." (2) The only way out of depression "is being found" in steady increase of employment in profitable, private enterprise. (3) Shortening of hours and raising of wages may be accomplished too rapidly, so that purchasing power and production would suffer. (4) Necessary price and production control has been due business in return for labour concessions; there will be no blanket code revision. This statement of policy clearly shows that the new N.R.A. differs from the old only in its more open drive to consolidate the advantages gained under the N.R.A.

The means of achieving the second aim of the big bourgeoisie, namely, the more drastic suppression of the rising wave of strike struggles, was delineated by **Roosevelt** himself in his proposal to use government machinery to effect a "truce" in labour struggles. In a "fireside" radio broadcast (September 30, 1934), carefully timed to coincide with the opening of the national convention of the American Federation of Labour, he proposed to

"confer within the coming month with small groups of those truly representative of large employers of labour and of large groups of organised labour, in order to seek their co-operation in establishing what I may describe as a specific trial period of industrial peace."

With his customary demagoguery, he declared further:—

"I shall not ask either employers or employees permanently to lay aside the weapons common to industrial war. . . . I shall ask both groups to give a fair trial to peaceful methods of adjusting their conflicts of opinion and interest and to experiment for a reasonable time with measures suitable to civilise our industrial civilisation."

That this is an attempt to induce workers not to strike while employers continue their drastic attack against wages, hours and working conditions and consolidate their profit gains is clearly indicated by its similarity to his statement on August 5, 1933, hailing the creation of the strike-breaking National Labour Board. At that time Roosevelt stated:—

"Of importance to the recovery programme is the appeal to management and labour for industrial peace. . . . it calls upon every individual in both groups to avoid strikes, lock-outs, or any aggressive action during the recovery programme." Through the activities of this board, together with the collaboration of the A.F. of L. officials, employers put through their drastic cut in wages, increased speed-up and intensified exploitation of the N.R.A. codes.

Roosevelt's "truce" is also a step toward the absolute outlawing of strikes. His commendation of the British anti-strike policy is proof of this. "Is it not a fact," he asked, "that relations between capital and labour on the basis of collective bargaining are much further advanced in Great Britain than in the United States?" In thus lauding the British national concentration government he voices the aims of one of the most vicious anti-union bodies in the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers. This body, according to **Wall Street Journal**, August 23, 1934, is planning a drive at the next session of Congress to place legal restrictions on the activities of labour unions, "has distributed copies of the British Trades Disputes Act of 1927 and apparently will sponsor some such law in the United States." The **Wall Street Journal** points out further that: "The British Act made strikes illegal under certain conditions, prohibited sympa-

thetic or general strikes, limited picketing and in general controlled local employment relations."

The British anti-strike law was enacted largely through the defeatist and treacherous policies of the Labour Party and trade union leaders, the social-fascists, MacDonald, Thomas, Snowden, Clynes. The acclaim and prompt action with which the A.F. of L. officials greeted Roosevelt's strike-breaking proposal is ample proof that these labour misleaders, collaborating with the N.R.A., are prepared to bind the American working class just as their British counter-parts did in 1927.

The recent developments of the N.R.A. and the "New Deal" programme as a whole are then another example of the rapid trend toward fascistisation of the leading capitalist countries. The New Deal promises of "collective bargaining" and labour's "right to organise" have proven to be their opposites—wage cuts, speed-up, unemployment, company unions, and brutal suppression of any organised attempt by the working class to improve its position.

Thus a year and a half of the New Deal has amply proven the correctness of the analysis of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. In his report to the Party on July 7, 1933, Earl Browder, secretary of the C.P.U.S.A., stated:

"For the working class the Industrial Recovery Act is truly an industrial slavery Act. It is one of the steps toward the militarisation of labour. It is a forerunner of American fascism."

Germany

The Frame-Up Against Ernst Thaelmann an International Provocation

(1) An Achievement of Fascist Demagogy—"High Treason"!

"High treason!" the phrase which the national socialists use to cloak their bloody extermination of all who stand in their way.

Just one moment, gentlemen, millions and millions of anti-fascists and world public opinion are not to be fobbed off so easily with a phrase of that sort.

Ernst Thaelmann has committed "high treason"? When, where and how, if you please? For twenty months he has been in your hands now and up to the moment you have produced no evidence against him to justify any such charge. World public opinion will not permit you to imprison, torture and slaughter men who have done nothing, but who, in your opinion, had the "intention" of doing something which you choose to call "high treason." World public opinion will not permit you to prophesy what your victims might have done "if," and then to present an unbelieving world with this prophecy as the "legal basis" for the death sentence and execution.

And another point, "high treason"? Committed against whom and what? Was it against "democracy"? The same democracy which you yourselves have attacked with violence and infamy of which no Marxist is capable because he is well aware of the historical connection between slavery, feudalism and capitalism?

Or was it perhaps "high treason" against the German Republic which you presented for fourteen years as "a shame and a humiliation" for Germany, as "Germany's lowest depth of degradation," as the work of "sub-humans" and of the "Learned Elders of Zion," whose constitution was riddled through and through even in the days of Ebert and Hindenburg and which you finally destroyed when you came to power, together with the last remnants of the rights of the working masses?

The executioners, the terrorists and the dictators who have proved in theory and practice a thousand times that the law, justice and the constitution mean nothing to them, that justice, the law and the constitution are "un-German," "un-Aryan" and the products of "rotten liberalism" which fascism will dispose of once and for all, these men want to charge Ernst Thaelmann with "high treason," with the violation of this same law, justice and constitution.

These irresponsible demagogues want to try Ernst Thaelmann for "high treason," although up to the time of his arrest and imprisonment his speeches and his actions were not indictable according to the prevailing laws and according to the constitution, and although these same laws and the constitution guaranteed him parliamentary immunity, and although legal and constitutional amnesties have removed him from the possibility of legal prosecution.

In view of these facts we demand his immediate and uncon-

ditional release. A cynical legal murder is being planned by an equally cynical juridical system. For this reason Thaelmann is being supported not only by his immediate friends and comrades, but by hundreds of thousands of indignant men and women, lawyers, authors, journalists, scientists and artists, and they will mobilise still greater masses in his defence.

(2) The "Planned Insurrection"—an Invention of Goebbels

"The Communist Party intended to carry out an armed insurrection in the spring of 1933." This deliberate lie of the German Propaganda Ministry has been repeated by Goering in public meetings, in broadcast speeches and in interviews.

To-day the whole world knows that this statement which is to form the gravamen of the charges against Ernst Thaelmann at his trial is a *deliberate lie*.

The decisions of the German Communist Party up to January 30, the date when Hitler came to power, are well known and they have been distributed in hundreds of thousands of printed statements. Amongst the printed material issued by the Communist Party is none which conveys any such suggestion.

Even after the burning of the Reichstag by the national socialists and after the letting loose of a horrible wave of terror against the working class, the Communist Party did not proclaim a revolutionary insurrection in view of the attitude of the leaders of the social-democratic party and of the German reformist trade union federation (A.D.G.B.) and in view of the illusions which were harboured by great masses of the middle class and of the peasantry.

In April, 1933, an official article by Fritz Heckert appeared in all the organs of the Communist International dealing with the question of whether the tactics of the Communist Party of Germany in the spring of 1933 were correct or not. This article pointed out that it was precisely Goering's plan to provoke the Communist Party into launching an armed insurrection and that the Communist Party acted absolutely correctly in refusing to fall into the trap prepared for it.

Although the brown terrorists may pretend that they do not know these facts, the world knows them and it knows still more. In autumn, 1933, a plenary session of the Executive Committee of the Communist International took place. At this Thirteenth Plenary Session the German Communist leader Wilhelm Pieck delivered a speech on the situation in Germany. Twenty Communists took part in the discussion on the German question. The resolutions of the session dealt in detail with the German situation. The speeches, the discussions and the resolutions were published throughout the world in a score of languages, as every reader of the newspapers knows, and they all point out that the Central Committee of the German Communist Party, under the leadership of Ernst Thaelmann, was correct when it refused to let itself be provoked by Goering into an armed insurrection.

Despite all these known facts the German fascists have the impudence to present a forged "plan of revolution" to support the indictment of Thaelmann.

Every thinking person is well aware that this precious "plan" is a product of the national socialist forgery workshops, and that the "witnesses" for the prosecution are corrupt and perjured wretches. Why is that perfectly clear?

The main aim of the *Dimitrov process* was not really to prove that Dimitrov and Torgler had set fire to the Reichstag. The whole indictment, the speeches of the Ministers and the evidence of the police witnesses, were all directed to proving that in the spring of 1933 the Communist Party of Germany had intended to launch an armed rising and that the burning of the Reichstag was to be the "signal" for the revolt.

Both these contentions collapsed utterly and miserably. The accused Communists had to be acquitted. A year after Hitler had come to power Dimitrov was released.

The sensational question now arises, *Why was the notorious "plan for armed insurrection" not produced in the Dimitrov process?* Why were not the witnesses whom the national socialists now claim to have in support of its "authenticity" not invited to give evidence in the Dimitrov process?

We shall shout this question throughout the whole world in order that the last decent, honest person may recognise the infamy which is being prepared against Thaelmann. Is it not clear that the whole Dimitrov-Torgler trial would have taken a completely different course if Goering and Goebbels had been able to produce an "authentic" plan for a Communist insurrection? That would

have been the sensation of the prosecution. What conclusions must be drawn from the fact that nothing of the sort was in fact produced?

Eleven months after the fascist government came to power not a single document and not a single witness could be produced in the most sensational process of the century to support the lying contention that the Communist Party had planned an armed insurrection. The national socialists had to swallow a signal defeat in the eyes of the whole world.

After twenty months, however, a "plan for armed revolution" has been discovered just in time for the Thaelmann trial and "witnesses" have also been discovered to support it!

No, the world will not let this shameless forgery pass without protest. We shall break the back of the precious "plan" which the forgers have produced in eighteen months of hard and painful work before the forgers have a chance to use it in order that world public opinion shall not be confused and misled. The production of this shameless "plan" is an indication of the great danger which is threatening Ernst Thaelmann and of the unscrupulousness which we may still expect.

(3) Temporary Conclusions

For the moment we have taken two points from the indictment because they seem of special importance to us. We shall later on take the other points in the indictment, the "accusation" of conspiracy, incitement to a general strike, terrorism and the new crime invented by the fascists to suit the case, "the will to crime" and "intellectual responsibility," and we shall come to equally important conclusions.

The Leipzig trial in which Dimitrov fought and won with the support of millions of men and women throughout the world, has proved that apart from the general political movement of solidarity with the accused, the concrete legal struggle against the fascist adventurers is of the greatest importance. This will also be the case in the coming trial of Ernst Thaelmann. However, the legal arguments also must be placed before the broad masses of the people in order that mass action may support the actions of the lawyers and of the juridical commissions and encourage them in the attack.

It has further been shown that if we use the correct arguments we can extend our influence far beyond the ranks of the working classes and win broad sections of the intelligentsia, the middle classes, the bourgeois radicals, the democrats and the republicans for our cause and for the international action to secure the release of the anti-fascist prisoners.

Therefore we must popularise these arguments and these facts in protest resolutions and meetings, in protest telegrams and through protest deputations, and we must urge on the anti-fascist lawyers to provide still further such legal arguments. This is also important for other reasons. In all capitalist countries fascism is making great progress in the State organs. Laws, justice, constitution, emergency decrees, exceptional laws, concentration camps, terrorism and legal murder—these are no longer purely "German questions." German fascism is finding apt pupils all over the world, even in countries which came under fascist dictatorships even before Germany did.

When we enter the lists against German fascism and German fascist "justice" in the Thaelmann process we are winning greater clarity and forging the weapons for the struggle against fascist "justice" and against the advance of fascism in all other capitalist countries.

International Release Action for Thaelmann by Railwaymen

Paris, October 21.

The railwaymen and transport workers of a number of countries, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and the Saar, organised a Thaelmann protest action on the same day. Stickybacks with twelve different slogans for the anti-fascist struggle and the release of Thaelmann were stuck on the trains and on the freight goods going to Germany. Two of these slogans were: "Heil Hitler means the executioner's axe! Fight for Thaelmann's release"; and "Free Thaelmann! Down with Hitler, Goering, Ley!" The Barcelona branch of the national trade union federation of the railwaymen of Spain (Amsterdam trade union) has resolved to take part in the Thaelmann release action. The railwaymen of Liege concealed leaflets with Thaelmann's photo in luggage going to Germany.

The Situation in the German High Schools

By A. Robert

All the social political measures of German Fascism amount to the same thing: whether it sends the young workers with hoe and spade on to the land, whether it places old skilled workers in the place of young workers, it always has the same result, skilled work, or social labour power, is diminished.

And so it happens that fascism has the effrontery to shout congratulations on the reduction in the number of students in German high schools, and to acclaim this as a success for its policy. Actually this reduction means a great loss in skilled labour power, a need for which exists, but which cannot be used by capitalism in its period of crisis.

This loss is very serious. The latest statistics show that the number of students in German scientific institutes has fallen from 115,722 to 95,667, i.e., 17.3 per cent. in the period from the summer term 1933 to the summer term 1934. It is typical of the capitalist crisis that this reduction is particularly high in the technical-scientific institutes. Even in the universities the figure is above the average, 19.3 per cent., but in the technical high schools it is 19.9 per cent., and in the mining colleges it is 20.4 per cent., and in the commercial institutes it rises even to 33.9 per cent.

This extraordinarily big reduction is not to be attributed solely to the introduction of the *numerus clausus*, but it is due chiefly to the breaking off of study in the middle of the course. This is admitted in the official statistics and at the same time looked a success.

Naturally the *numerus clausus* has its effect. It constitutes a sharpening of the development in regard to the high schools, but in no way means that this is the first time that there is a decline in the entries to the high schools. The figures of new enrolments have been going down since 1931 as a result of the crisis. The statistics show the following development:—

New Enrolments in the German High Schools

1931	30,800
1932	25,400
1933	15,500 (<i>numerus clausus</i>)
1934	10,000

The table shows the sudden drop between the years 1932 and 1933. Here fascism came more sharply into play. Its policy did not bring in anything new: in this sphere, as in all others, it made the position catastrophically worse.

All these figures give only a superficial picture of what today is the fate of the young intellectuals of Germany, of German science. If a part of the students are thrown out of the high schools, because capitalism does not know what to do with them, and therefore tries to get rid of them by abandoning them to hunger—the other part which remains at the high schools is not used in order to create new skilled cadres. The fact is, that a number of important professors have been dismissed because they were "Non-Aryans" or "Liberal." On the other hand, a number of national-socialist professors were appointed whose qualifications consisted of their party card. And thus the scientific level of the German high schools has fallen enormously.

On the other hand, the students are more and more withdrawn from the high schools and used for the carrying through of special tasks in the interests of the fascist state. The whole high school policy of the National Socialists is directed to making the students a special guard which is prepared to go through fire and water in the interests of the monopoly capitalist chiefs of National Socialism.

The labour camps, military training and other developments of fascist militarisation all serve the same purpose, and their initiators were to a large extent students. The effect of these measures is that the students are occupied almost exclusively with military drill and compulsory meetings of the fascist organisations, with the result that they have very little time left for actual study. A special Commando keeps watch over the students. Typical of these methods is the "voluntary" enlistment of students in the Reichswehr, recently introduced, whereby the year which is passed in the army is reckoned as a study year.

There is a similar development in the schools. One whole day a week is devoted exclusively to the military training of school children. All these children, of whom only a small number have the intention of passing on to a scientific high school and con-

tinuing their education, every Saturday the State Youth Day, go out in uniform in order to be trained in the use of arms.

All this is the consistent carrying out of the will of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie, in its crisis, has no interest either in the further development of science or in the formation of educated scientific cadres. It wants to make the students into an instrument of its political will: they are to be the bearers and producers of fascist ideology, they are to form the cadres of a fascist civil war army and an imperialist armed force.

Why do the students appear to be suited to this purpose? It is well known that the students were among the first who joined up with National Socialism. They believed that in the "Third Reich" they could find something which they had not found in the Weimar Republic; social usefulness, i.e., a profession and future prospects. So they were easy prey for National Socialism. With its usual demagogy it promised them a revolutionary change of the economic system, which, on the one hand, would allow everyone to study, and, on the other hand, would give everyone a profession and a job. It promised a "National Socialist high school" which would overcome the sterility of the old "liberalist" science.

Everything that has been done up to now is in direct contradiction to what the Nazis promised before the seizure of power. The economic situation of the students has grown worse rather than better. Over and above the high fees, subscriptions for sport and other things have to be paid. Apart from this, all those who do not provide full guarantees of their political "soundness" cannot count on any stipend or reduction of fees. There are fewer prospects of a profession than ever, as the limitation of admission shows clearly enough. The scientific level of the high schools has fallen.

Therefore, it is understandable that German students, who were looked upon as a special guard for capitalism, are more and more becoming the most unreliable elements of the National Socialist Party. The continual change in the leadership of the German students reflects the deep inner rift which runs through this organisation.

The national socialist students expect their leaders to carry through a sharp fight against the corporations which want to continue the whole rotten tradition of the old drinking student, the undignified tomfoolery of the old "student glory." The only social function of these corporations consists of providing soft sinecures for the sons of Prussian Junkers and high government officials. The fury of the students against this rotten system can be understood. The leadership of the students, therefore, was compelled to carry on a sharp fight against the corporations, which, however, was soon exposed as being nothing else but a piece of humbug. The fulminant speeches against "caste spirit" and symbolic acts, such as the burning of corporation caps, have lost their attraction; it is deeds that is wanted.

The nomination of Feickert, and his order for the founding of Comradeship Houses, is intended as a move to soothe exacerbated feelings. On the one hand, it is to give the impression that Feickert is safeguarding the "revolutionary S.A. tradition" of the students and wants it to continue, that he is ready to strike a decisive blow against the corporations, and on the other hand it has the purpose of continuing the militarisation of the students in a sharper form and of keeping them under the strongest control. But the first misfortune happened immediately: The corporations publicly protested with unusual sharpness, and Feickert, obediently following their wishes, had to give them the right to establish their own Comradeship Houses, where they could cultivate their "caste spirit" in its purest form. That made the whole situation worse, and the leadership of the students vacillated between the embittered national socialist students and the corporations supported by wide circles of the bourgeoisie. It is already rumoured that they will be forced to withdraw the order for the Comradeship Houses and may well come a cropper over this business. That would be the third set of leaders which have been used up since Hitler's coming to power, quite apart from numerous removals of district leadership.

All this is bound to have the most serious effect in the camp of the students, and open the eyes of those who have not yet clearly seen through the policy of Hitler fascism. Not a single one of the economic and political promises of the Nazis has been fulfilled; they must to-day recognise that they have been shamefully deceived right from the beginning.

The old troop of those who from the beginning fought against

fascism in the university could not be destroyed. Even to-day, after hundreds have been removed, the revolutionary student groups are still working in the high schools. They continually issue material which throws a light on the position in the high schools and show the students that fascism has broken all its promises, that the future of the intellectual youth of Germany lies only in a socialist state. By coming forward on behalf of the every-day demands of the students and showing themselves as true revolutionary comrades, they are drawing the masses of disappointed students over into the camp of the working class, into the camp of fighting anti-fascists.

And so a new army grows, which fights against fascist oppression for the emancipation of labour and science. Every German student must understand that only oppression awaits him in Hitler's Third Reich. He must recognise that only in a socialist Germany can a freed science flourish. As soon as he has come to understand this he will enter into the great front of all the deceived, who are fighting against the national socialist deceivers. On the side of the workers who have been deceived over bread and wages, on the side of the youth who have been deceived over professions and their future, on the side of all small peasants and handicraftsmen, who daily and hourly have been deceived over their tiny bit of property, the student will step forwards as an enthusiastic soldier of the revolution in the fight against the Third Reich.

At the World Congress of Students in Geneva, the German students will be represented. Coming from the barrack-room atmosphere of Germany, they will indict fascism before the whole world, and their fighting call against this system of oppression will ring out. The technical workers of Germany's socialist future rise and stretch their hands to their brothers. To their brothers throughout the world and to their brothers, the working class.

Spain

The Epic of Asturias

Even the reports which the reactionary Spanish newspapers publish testify to the great heroism and the high degree of organisation of the Asturian miners who took up arms against the fascist government.

The fascist "El Debate" publishes a report on the fighting in Asturias in which it is stated:—

"The impression which the population have of the methods employed by the workers is the following: The insurgents were under the leadership of people who had a mastery of military science. This can be seen from the discipline, the organisation and order which they preserved during the attack and the way in which they organised various services in the rear, the supply of food and medical requirements."

The same issue of the "El Debate" publishes a report of a conversation with Senor Mieres, the leader of the fascist organisation "People's Action." This fascist was taken prisoner by the workers during the insurrection. He has to admit that the Asturian workers were strictly organised. He states that the workers formed groups of 10 to 12 men, each group being under a commander. The revolutionaries mobilised the doctors in order to tend the wounded. In the ranks of the revolutionaries there were many quite young people, even 12 to 14 years of age, who were armed with rifles like the adults. The women also fought together with the workers.

In the Turon district the workers set up a special organisation which had the task of maintaining uninterrupted work in the mines. They appointed new engineers and mine managers and removed the old managers, whom they held as hostages.

Revolutionary orders were posted up on the walls of the town, as for instance:—

"It is hereby declared that the tenant farmers are the lawful owners of the land which they have rented of the landowners."

A doctor who has returned from Asturias relates in the same paper that the workers, after they had taken possession of the munition factories, immediately set production going and kept the factories working full capacity. He writes:—

"On October 8 I was in Trubija (where the largest arms factory in Spain is situated). The factory worked at full pressure. The workers formed a council. They wished to produce

munitions for the attack on the capital and for their defence. When I arrived in Trubija the Soviet had already been formed. The workers had declared a state of siege and were working with Communist methods. At 12 o'clock the factory siren was sounded. The workers gathered together armed; they showed great military discipline. Work in the factory was continued. We learned that they had begun to produce No. 15 guns in order to bombard Oviedo. We also learnt that they were manufacturing armour plate for motor-cars.

"The officers of the town garrison were arrested and the commander of the garrison, who offered resistance, was killed.

"We asked for food and received a coupon to be presented at the commissariat department. . . . As a doctor I was unmolested, but was forbidden to return to Oviedo."

The same newspaper reports that the workers compelled the food dealers to hand over their wares to them. The insurgents had their revolutionary tribunal and their staff. They set up their observation posts and their intelligence service. The "El Debate" further reports:—

"In Oleros, where the Communists have the majority, a strong armed group was formed which organised an attack on the explosive stores at the pit and provided themselves with explosive."

According to the reports of the "El Debate," the damage caused as a result of the fighting between the workers and troops in Oviedo amounts to 200 million pesetas, and in the whole of Asturias to about 2,000 million pesetas. This sum does not include the state buildings which have been destroyed. Various armament factories in Asturias will not be able to recommence work for months.

"El Debate" writes that the workers of Asturias made preparations to invade the neighbouring mining district of Leon. Armed troops were concentrated on the frontier of this district, who were waiting for the order to attack. But in Leon itself, in a number of mining localities, the workers seized power.

The monarchist newspaper "A.B.C." gives details of the armed attack on Gijón, a harbour town of Asturias. The newspaper points out that the revolutionaries erected barricades out of fragments of iron across all streets connecting the district they occupied with the centre of the town. The barricades were manned by about 100 workers from the town armed with rifles, bombs and revolvers. They received reinforcements from the armed miners, who came to Oviedo in small motor-lorries. The defenders of the barricades had about 200 revolvers. They confiscated the food in the shops in their district. The supply of food was organised by the revolutionary committee.

Manifesto of the C.P. of Spain

Madrid, October 27.

During the whole revolutionary movement the Communist Party has not ceased for a moment to issue slogans to the masses, and to direct their struggle by means of leaflets and appeals. From October 4 to 15 leaflets were issued daily to the workers, peasants, soldiers, women, etc. These leaflets contained news from the fighting districts, since no newspapers were appearing except a few fascist publications; they also contained the most necessary fighting slogans. At the present time an appeal of the Communist Party is being distributed all over Spain, emphasising the lessons to be learnt from the recent struggle.

This appeal formulates as follows the reasons why the revolutionary struggle did not lead to victory:—

"Because, as our Party has always and unceasingly declared, the political and organisational preparations for the revolution were insufficient, because its programme was not made known to the whole of the working masses, because not enough was done to popularise what the revolution will give to the workers and peasants, the soldiers, and all the exploited. The fact was ignored that revolution is not made but organised. And that the organisation of revolution cannot be confined only to groups of people "prepared to do anything," but that "the whole of the forces of the working class, and the immediate allies of the revolution, the peasants, must be drawn into the struggle."

The appeal refers to the resolution adopted by the C.C. of the Communist Party, which pointed out as early as September that without the enlistment of the peasantry for the Workers' Alliance the victory of the revolution could not be assured. This, too, is

the reason why the army, consisting mainly of peasants did not go over to the side of the revolution. . . .

"The problem of power, the fundamental question of every revolution, was not placed clearly before the masses of workers and peasants. The great majority of these did not know to whom, to what organs, they had to give the power, or what this power signified for them. In order that the great masses should play their part in the struggle, they must be thoroughly permeated beforehand with the programme which calls them to fight, which forms their banner. Since this was not done, the gigantic powers of the united proletariat in every factory, every mine, every farm, remained latent. And therefore neither factory committees, nor committees of the peasantry, nor alliances formed at the places of work—none of the organs for the preparation of the armed insurrection, the embryonic organs of the power of the triumphant revolution (Soviets)—were set up. That all this was lacking was no accident. It accorded with the unclear conceptions and tactics. The theory and practice of revolution were absent.

"The unity and discipline required by the party of the revolution were absent. In the very heart of the socialist party, side by side with revolutionaries ready for any sacrifice, there are elements who do not seek to conceal their hostility against all revolutionary action. This was bound to be reflected in vacillations in instructions, in confused and contradictory directions. Therefore the frightful error was committed that the general strike was not carried out before the formation of the government. This meant leaving the initiative in the hands of the enemy. Another frightful error was the leaving of the issue of the struggle in the hands of such vacillating persons as Companys. . . .

"If the revolution is to be victorious, it must remain in all its forms in the hands of the exploited. This has been once more demonstrated by our heroic comrades in Asturias and Biskaya."

The manifesto further deals with the monstrous betrayal of the revolution by the anarchist leaders, points out the necessity of continuing the struggle as unitedly in the future as during the last few days, and concludes by stressing that there can be only one Party of the revolution—the Party which bases its activities on the experience gained in two victorious revolutions, the Russian and the Chinese.

Committee Formed in Paris for the Anti-Fascist Prisoners in Spain

Paris, October 27.

On the initiative of the *World Committee against War and Fascism*, a committee has been formed in Paris for the Spanish and Catalonian political prisoners. The committee has already sent two telegrams to Lerroux, one signed by such scholars as Langevin, Perin, Painlevé, etc., the other by such authors as Gide, Malraux, Cassou, etc. These telegrams protest against the terror and the imprisonment of anti-fascists, and especially against the death sentences.

Success in Soviet Industry

The increased production of electric lamps requires the mechanisation of the production of glass bulbs, which hitherto have been manufactured by hand in the Soviet Union. The People's Commissariat for Heavy Industry has instructed the chief management of the electrical industry to introduce automatic glass-blowing machines. The automatic glass-blowing plant, built according to the designs of two Soviet engineers, turns out 450,000 bulbs a day. It will be installed in the glass works of Rjasan.

Electric ovens are being introduced for the mechanisation of bakeries. Thus the Saporoshe bakery has introduced a new electric oven with a capacity of 60 kilowatt, in which 300 kilogrammes of bread can be baked simultaneously. This type of oven, which is new in the Soviet Union, was designed by the Soviet engineer Voroshko. All the apparatus and parts of the oven were manufactured in Soviet factories out of Soviet raw material.

In the Dynamo works electro-magnetic cranes are being manufactured which are being employed in all branches of industry. Up to now 38 such magnetic cranes with hoisting capacities of 3 and 5 tons material have been manufactured. They have proved satisfactory and are not behind the imported magnetic cranes. By the end of the year the Dynamo works will complete another 50 magnetic cranes with a hoisting capacity of 5 tons.

Fight for the Unity of the Labour Movement

The C.P. of Great Britain Stands for Unity

By R. Bishop (London)

That the Communist Party stands for the greatest measure of working-class unity against fascism, war and capitalism is a fact that is becoming more and more widely recognised by the workers. Greater and greater irritation is being shown at the repeated attempts of the Labour Party and reformist trade union leadership to sabotage such unity.

Local Labour Parties and trade union branches which a year ago contemptuously dismissed the Communist Party as mere "disruptors" have now learned the lessons of Germany and Austria, have seen what the united front has meant in France and other countries, and are to-day operating united front activities with Communists and with other workers outside the pale of Transport House, who are prepared to fight alongside of them.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, who on the formation of the second Labour government said: "We are anxious to treat the business man as a friend and a brother," is frantically trying to stem the tide which is flowing in the direction of the united front. He has declared in a statement:—

"The Communists and the I.L.P. made approaches to our people, and these were reported to me. Instructions were at once given by the London Labour Party that no electoral arrangements must be made with either the Communist Party or the I.L.P., and I have every reason to believe that these instructions are being faithfully carried out."

On every issue the call for united action has been turned down by the bureaucrats. They have refused to co-operate with the militants in the fight against fascism—issuing instructions to Labour Party members to "Stay Away" from all such demonstrations, instructions which, to their credit, hundreds of thousands of Labour Party workers have refused to obey.

They refused to co-operate in any activity against war. They refused to co-operate in the organisation of solidarity action on behalf of the Spanish workers. They have instructed their delegate to the Labour and Socialist International to vote against the united front proposals put to the L.S.I. by the Comintern.

The local organisations of the C.P.G.B. approached the Borough and Divisional Labour Parties and Labour candidates for the municipal elections with a view to securing united action on the most important issues facing the working class.

In some cases the local Labour Parties and their candidates have refused to discuss the proposals on the grounds that they were made too late, others have refused to discuss them, pleading that the Labour Party, the Trades Union Congress and the Co-operative Party constitute by themselves the broadest possible united front.

But the rank and file Labour Party members and supporters are recognising in increasing numbers that the Communist Party has been trying for many years to establish the united front and that the latest events—particularly the heroic fight of the Spanish workers and the recent extension of the united front between the C.P. and S.P. of France in the municipal elections (resulting in substantial working-class gains)—completely justify the C.P.G.B. in making yet another attempt in this direction, an attempt to secure unity against the enemies of the working class in the British municipal elections.

In many areas the Communist Party has approached the local Labour Party for agreement on a certain minimum programme: Return of wage cuts, extra winter relief, a fight against the provisions of the second part of the Unemployment Act, against the Sedition Bill, against fascism and war. In return for such an agreement the Communist Party has promised to withdraw its candidates to ensure that the seat shall not be lost to the enemies of the workers by reason of a split vote. In many cases this offer has been rejected. In quite a number it has been accepted. In various parts of the country local Labour Parties have understood the need for unity and have accepted the proposals.

Where the offer has been turned down, local workers are bombarding the candidates and agents with questions as to why

this offer of united action was turned down, and demanding that the candidates pledge themselves to united action inside and outside the Councils with the C.P., the I.L.P. (and anyone else who will co-operate) for these demands.

As far as the Independent Labour Party and the C.P. are concerned, meetings have taken place wherever candidates were proposed in opposition to each other, and agreement has been reached as to withdrawal of one or other of them.

But as far as the Labour Party is concerned it is only the determination of the rank and file to secure unity which will force the national leadership to abandon their wrecking policy of refusing all united front approaches out of hand.

Limited though the success achieved has been in connection with the united front at the municipal elections, it will clear the way in many areas for united action on other issues. The demand for the restoration of wage cuts, for instance, applies not only to municipal workers and employees, but to all workers. The return of Councillors pledged to this demand gives the basis for a wide campaign after the elections, waged from both inside and outside the Councils. The demand of additional winter relief for the unemployed is another one that can be waged successfully if the drive of the unemployed from outside is reinforced by a determined campaign inside the Councils themselves.

The demands for a fight against the slave camps set up under the Unemployment Act, and against the infamous Sedition Bill, and against war and fascism, have been described by the local Labour leaders in some places as being outside the scope of municipal politics. This is only true in the narrowest sense. In actual practice the fight on each of these issues of vital importance to the working class can be made vastly stronger if in every municipal council there are men and women prepared to raise these issues. For instance, quite a number of Councils have already passed resolutions protesting against the Sedition Bill, demanding the release of Thaelmann, etc. If, in addition, local Councillors will use the prestige of their positions to arouse wide interest in the campaigns and working-class action around them, then, indeed, will they go forward with redoubled effectiveness.

The Labour Party, the Trades Union Congress and the Co-operative movement do, it is true, command the support of a very large section of the working class—but that is not the same as saying that they constitute all that is necessary in the way of a working-class united front.

The militants in their ranks—and there are hundreds of thousands of them—appreciate the work of the Communist Party, understand that their leadership in the fight against fascism, to take but one example, has done more than anything else to cement working-class unity and to stem the fascist tide in Britain.

The fight against fascism has served to unite large sections of the working class, despite the deliberate sabotage of the Labour Party leaders, but it is obvious that a mistaken sense of "loyalty" to leaders has kept many workers, who would otherwise have done so, from joining in. A united front in which all sections could officially participate would win great victories for the working class. The French example stands out with the greatest clarity for all who are not wilfully blind to see.

Realising this—and for no other reason—abandoning all idea of mere Party advantage, in the interests of the working class alone, the Communist Party has refused to accept the rebuffs with which they have been met, and have on every possible occasion renewed their efforts to build up the united fighting front of the entire working class again and again, culminating their appeal in connection with the local elections.

In many areas Communist candidates are going forward at the present elections. In others they have been withdrawn and are appearing on Labour Party and I.L.P. platforms. The indications are that big increases will be recorded in the Communist vote in most places. In many places which have never returned a Communist to an elected body there are indications that this time Communist Councillors will be returned.

As an instance of what happens when the Communist Party appeal has met with a response from Labour candidates, I may quote an example from Glasgow. In the Anderston Ward of that city, one of the most proletarian quarters, the Labour candidate, Councillor Ratcliffe, and the local members of the C.P. have come to the following agreement:—

"While there are basic differences in policy there is the

basic need for working-class unity in the fight for lower rents, increased child and maternal welfare, work schemes for the unemployed and increased benefits, against the Unemployment Act and Sedition Bill and against fascism and war.

"That the platform during the campaign be devoted to securing the unity of the workers for active struggle on these issues and that representatives of the C.P. and the Labour Party take part in all meetings."

In view of this agreement, the Communist Party has withdrawn its candidate in the ward and is concentrating all available forces in the ward to secure victory, on the basis of mass unity, for the Labour candidate.

Side by side with the united front campaign, the Communist Party is going forward with its independent campaign, under the slogan "Class against Class." Every Communist candidate is pledged to fight inside and outside the Councils for the workers' demands. Their election to the Councils will constitute a big gain for the entire working-class movement.

But in every election campaign the united front is being placed as a concrete issue before the working class. Concerted mass pressure can compel the bureaucrats to give way. It is not without significance that last Sunday at a tremendous demonstration in Trafalgar Square against the Sedition Bill, the chairman of the National Executive of the Labour Party (W. A. Robinson) and Mary Carlin (another member of the Labour Party E.C.) spoke on the same platform as William Gallacher, J. R. Campbell and Isabel Brown (the Communist Secretary of the German Relief Committee).

At the Labour Party Conference the strongest pressure was brought to bear to prevent any association with Communists or organisations which allowed Communists into membership. But on every major issue—the fight against fascism, the fight against the Sedition Bill, etc.—the Communists are in the vanguard of the struggle. More and more insistently the workers are demanding that the Labour leaders also get into the struggle, thus, against their wills, they find it impossible to disentangle themselves from the united front because—the workers demand unity.

A maintenance and intensification of the pressure for a broad united front will break down the resistance of the reformists. Therefore, through the trade union branches, the local Labour Parties, the factories, the Co-op. Guilds, and everywhere else that workers gather together, the pressure must be kept up.

Forward to the working-class united front!

The Czech Social Democracy on the Negotiations of the Two Internationals

By G. Friedrich (Prague)

The recent offer by the Communist International to the Labour and Socialist International, and the first personal conversations between the representatives of the C.I. and the L.S.I. which followed it; at the first moment frightened the two parties of the Czechoslovakian social democracy, which are on the extreme Right wing of the Second International, which have four Ministers in the Czechoslovakian Government. What, however, have they to say to this question which is of vital importance to the proletariat of the whole world?

The situation in Czechoslovakia to-day is such that unity of the working class, the realisation of unity of action against fascism, which is regrouping and concentrating its forces, are urgently necessary. The wirepullers connected with the Zivnostenska banking concern openly admire Hitler and his methods, and are creating a mass basis for their movement by drawing into it the worst chauvinistic movement, the "National League," which is headed by a notoriously corrupt person. In the Sudetic German district, Hitler's agency, the Sudetic German Home Front, led by Henlein, have received permission from the government parties to carry on their fascist activity. In spite of the situation, in spite of the uninterrupted and increasing attacks on the working class, in spite of the fact that the fascists are uniting their forces, the social democracy rejected and still rejects the offer made by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia of a pact for the purpose of making a common attack on fascism. Not only that, in those places where the united front has been set up against the will of the leaders, the party apparatus intervenes and violently destroys that which the workers have built up in order to defend their interests. This was the case, for example, in Bohemian Leipa,

when Henlein carried out his fascist provocation, under the protection of 500 gendarmes placed at his disposal by the government. Here the representatives of the Czech and German social democracy had agreed with the Communist Party to hold a joint demonstration against Henlein fascism. This demonstration was called off at the last moment on the orders of the social democratic headquarters, and the field was left free for Henlein.

The German and Czech social democratic press, it is true, printed the appeal of their International for solidarity demonstrations to be held immediately on behalf of the Spanish proletariat, but at the same time the social democratic Minister of Justice, Dr. Derer, caused the appeal published in the Communist press calling on the workers to send protest telegrams to the Spanish Embassy to be censored. Thus a social democratic Minister of Justice even forbids solidarity demonstrations for his own party members, for Caballero, who is a member of the executive of the Second International.

This attitude of the social democracy of Czechoslovakia is perfectly in line with the policy consistently pursued by it, namely, of serving the bourgeoisie and its system right up to the last moment, for protecting and defending the capitalist system, cost what it may. And therefore the social democratic press immediately assured the bourgeoisie that should an agreement be come to between the Second and Third Internationals this would in no way affect the attitude of the Czech social democracy. Josef Stivin, the chief editor of the "Pravo Lidu," wrote:—

"We regard such an agreement as impossible in the present circumstances, when parties of the Second International are participating in the government or even have the government power in their hands, and the other smaller part is represented only by emigrants. It is simply a waste of time and money."

The "Pravo Lidu" reminds its readers that, in the new party programme adopted in the year 1930, it is expressly pointed out that the party can oppose decisions of international Congresses when circumstances render this necessary. In fact the "Pravo Lidu" even declares:—

"It is not true to say that the International has any right to order what our attitude to the Communists shall be. That is entirely our affair. Nobody can compel us to attach the soundly breathing body of our party to the Bolshevik corpse of subversive fractions, subversive persons, who, as has been confirmed, act on the orders of the police and military spies. We prefer to co-operate with the Republic and with those who defend it than with Krosnar, whose parliamentary immunity was suspended in order that the authorities might prosecute him for serious offences against the State."

That is and can only be the language of people who have nothing in common with the proletariat. Rather co-operate with the representatives of bank and agrarian capital and the government than with Communist representatives of the working class in the interests of the working people! That is the meaning of this social democratic declaration. Krosnar, who is referred to here as a symbol for the C.P. of Czechoslovakia, and is represented as an abominable Communist criminal, is no one else than one of the four Communist deputies who were accused of high treason on account of a leaflet issued at the last Presidential election, entitled "Not Masaryk but Lenin!" He is a worker who is known to tens of thousands of proletarians of Czechoslovakia as the leader of the unemployed movement, and is honoured by them as such.

The Czech social democracy is even prepared to sever its already very loose connections with the Second International in order the better to serve the bourgeoisie. Thus, "Nova Doba," the Pilsen organ of the Czech social democracy, writes:—

"No International and no authority—if one can speak at all of any strong international authority—can in any way alter this fundamental principle of the Czechoslovakian Labour Movement. The State, which we won by means of revolution and have since built up, is ours and nobody can or may meddle in our affairs."

That is the whole standpoint of the Czech social democratic leaders to the question of unity of the workers; that is their standpoint to the heroic fight of the Spanish workers.

The German social democrats follow the same line as the Czech social democrats, with whom they peacefully sit together in the government. But in view of the mood of the German workers they cannot speak so openly and brutally. Therefore the "Sozial-Demokrat," the central organ of the German social democracy in Czechoslovakia, engages in a lot of talk about the

"hopes of political unity of the working class, and the obstacles in its way." It attempts to prove that to-day it is "very late" to set up this unity. It goes on to state that the Comintern has changed its tactics, in view of "the serious foreign political dangers threatening Soviet Russia." Further, the old and oft-refuted lie is again trotted out that the Communists in Germany frustrated the setting up of the united front before Hitler came into power, and finally the Communists are accused of having always co-operated with the indifferent elements and the Nazis and opposed social democracy. Proceeding from these "arguments" the "Sozial-Demokrat" comes to the remarkable conclusion that the bourgeoisie to-day is using the Communists as a counter-weight to social democracy. If, however, the united front with the Communists is realised, then the bourgeoisie will demand the prohibition of the Communists. And the social democrats would then be compelled to do everything in defence of the Communists. In such a case, they declare, they would have considerably more to lose than the Communists. This is saying, in other words, the same thing that the Czech social democracy demands: No united front with the Communists!

Thus the Czechoslovakian social democracy openly opposes unity of action of the proletariat. Formerly it endeavoured by means of every conceivable excuse to prevent the united front. Formerly the social democratic leaders continually declared that the two Internationals must first unite. To-day, when this excuse can no longer be used, they plainly and openly declare: Even if the Internationals unite there must be no united front in Czechoslovakia, because the bourgeoisie do not want this!

For the United Front in Ireland

We publish below, in abridged form, a letter sent by the C.P. of Ireland to the Irish Labour Party, which met in Dublin last week-end.—Ed.

The Communist Party desires to bring to the notice of the Labour Party Conference that the overthrow of the power of the present governing classes and the establishment of a Workers' Republic with all power in the hands of the workers, allied with the small farmers, as a step to the construction of a classless Socialist society, is its final objective. At the same time it strongly holds that the immediate political issue before the Irish working class is the destruction of imperialism, the unification and freedom of the country, and that the war-cry of a Workers' Republic divorced from this issue would be misleading and a possible source of misdirection of working-class energy, unless so joined to the independence issue.

While thus recognising there are differences between it and the Labour Party, the Communist Party of Ireland believes, at the same time, that these differences should not be allowed to stand in the path of a common effort by all sections of the workers' movement to strengthen the fighting power of the wage-earning and farming masses on the immediate issues, in particular against the growing arrogance of the imperialist ascendancy and its fascist allies among the business and propertied classes, as expressed by the naked fascist propaganda in the Press and in definite action by the pro-imperialist land holders, who are conducting what amounts almost to a campaign of guerilla civil war under the leadership of the fascists. . . .

In view of these facts and the Administrative Council's draft resolution declaring for a Workers' Republic and the expressed resolve to combat the fascist menace, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ireland advances the following suggestions for your consideration, in the sincere belief that along these or similar lines the working-class front can be unified and strengthened against the dangers now threatening and the way opened for the realisation of a Republic in which the toilers will be the ruling class, the Workers' and Farmers' Republic.

Our suggestions are as follows:—

(a) That steps be taken to organise a nation-wide campaign by means of demonstrations, meetings and written propaganda, explaining the anti-working-class character of fascism and rousing the masses to daily struggle against it.

(b) That December 8, the anniversary of the execution of Liam Mellows (the foremost exponent of Labour social principles in the Republican movement) and his three comrades, be set aside as a day of united working-class rallies against fascism and for national independence, and to popularise the ultimate aims of the working-class movement.

(c) To ensure the success of any steps by the Parliamentary

Labour Party for the amendment of the Unemployed Assistance Act in favour of the workless, a campaign be undertaken to rouse the organised and unorganised workers in support of the demands of the unemployed for abolition of the present pauper scales of relief and the granting of adequate winter maintenance.

(d) That effectively to combat the attempts of the imperialist land holders to draw numbers of working farmers under their influence for anti-Labour purposes and to the detriment of the real interests of the farmers themselves, the working-class movement take steps to organise the small farmers in alliance with the urban workers for mass action to enforce the demands of the Labour Party branches for relief from rates, division of ranches, land allotments for labourers and increased wages for the agricultural workers.

(e) That in order to transform the struggle for a Workers' Republic into a living issue and to arouse the working class to the fight for its realisation, the Labour Party in the Oireachtas move for the abolition of all vestiges of imperialist domination: the dismissal of the Governor-General, the dissolution of the Dail and the summoning of a genuinely representative assembly, in which all democratic sections could participate, and so remove the main barrier to the realisation of a Workers' Republic—foreign interference in the country's domestic affairs.

That the operation of action on similar lines against the Northern imperialists be the subject of joint consultation between the Irish and Northern Labour Parties and the Central Committee of the Communist Party and its Northern section.

Should our proposals for a mutual understanding on these issues meet with the approval of your Conference, we suggest that representatives of the incoming Administrative Council meet together with representatives from our Central Committee to enable whatever understanding for joint effort can be arrived at to be worked out in detail.

Further, that mutual abstention from hostile criticism shall be observed by all parties supporting the United Front, and this we undertake to observe in our weekly and monthly journals and spoken propaganda.

The Labour Movement

Lessons of the General Textile Strike in the U.S.A.

By Carl Reeve (New York)

The bloody general textile strike of over 500,000 workers was the largest strike in the history of the class struggle in the United States. It demonstrated a new high level of militancy and the great fighting capacity of the workers: They are ready to re-strike now, in spite of the severe terror, black-list, and betrayal which they experienced. The strike, which was against worsening conditions under the N.R.A., showed that the workers can expect nothing but bullets and denial of their demands from the New Deal. They faced the severest terror from the Roosevelt government, twenty being killed and many gassed and shot, but they fought back militantly, paralysing the textile industry.

After three weeks they were betrayed by the Gorman-Green-A.F.L. leadership in the most brazen sell-out in the history of the Labour movement. The strike and its betrayal showed the necessity for a fighting, class struggle programme and rank and file leadership if the demands are to be won.

The cotton textile code was the first code adopted. Under it, the minimum wage was set at 13 dollars for the North and twelve dollars for the South. But during the past year and a half the textile employers have hammered down living standards below this minimum. The stretch-out (speed-up) was intensified greatly. Workers were told that new piecework rates were set, and if they could not make the minimum wage by faster work under the new rates, they could get out. The minimum wage had been set for the forty-hour week. No minimum was set for hours below the forty. Pay envelopes of four, five, and six dollars for thirty hours are not uncommon, and have been collected by the hundreds by textile organisers. For skilled and semi-skilled workers the minimum wage became the maximum; experienced workers were forced to take "learners'" wages.

On top of these rapidly worsening conditions, the Roosevelt government in the spring ordered a "curtailment" in hours of 25 per cent., without any increase in pay. This meant a 25 per cent. wage cut. The cotton textile workers answered by voting for

strike. The strike date was set for the first week in June. At the last moment the MacMahon-Gorman leadership called the strike off, without consulting the workers, and signed an agreement with Johnson and the N.R.A. whereby they accepted the curtailment, and agreed to call off the strike.

A similar course took place in the **woollen** industry as cotton. The woollen and worsted workers voted to strike on July 2. The Gorman-MacMahon leadership called off the strike at the last moment and accepted a government "Wool Board," which, in the same manner as cotton, robbed the woollen and worsted workers of their demands.

It was the overwhelming demand of the masses of textile workers which forced the leadership of the United Textile Workers' Union, the Gorman-MacMahon machine, to call the strike. The national convention of the U.T.W., held the week of August 13, decided on the strike. Gorman and MacMahon did not want the strike. At the last minute they pleaded with the delegates to allow the executive council to set the strike date. But the workers would not be put off any longer; the delegates voted that the strike must be declared on or before September 1. Scores of resolutions demanding strike poured into the convention.

After the convention, hundreds of telegrams poured in on Gorman at Washington from the locals, demanding that the strike take place as instructed by the convention. The response to the strike completely surprised the manufacturers.

The strategy of the Gorman leadership during the strike was a continuation of that in the convention. The leaders were forced by the militancy of the workers to severely criticise the N.R.A. decisions in order to keep the leadership. But the Gorman leadership throughout attempted to maintain the faith of the textile workers in President Roosevelt. They attempted to make a differentiation between General Johnson, the code authorities, and the old Cotton Textile Relations Board on the one hand, and President Roosevelt and any new "impartial" board he might set up on the other.

To win the strike it was obviously necessary to **spread the strike** as broadly and as rapidly as possible. The Gorman Strike Committee of five, which was appointed by the Executive Council, did just the opposite. Gorman made every effort to confine the strike to the cotton textile industry.

But the sweeping militancy of the workers continued to broaden the strike during the entire three weeks it lasted. Mass picketing and flying squadrons, initiated by the masses of the workers themselves, swept the field. In **New England** the mass picket lines closed down mills regardless of the branch of industry, including the tire fabric mills, hosiery, woollen, silk, rayon, and even garment shops. However, Gorman succeeded in keeping the bulk of the hosiery and dye workers at work throughout the strike.

Not only did Gorman not try to spread the strike, but attempted to stop **mass picketing**. Instead he counselled "peaceful picketing" and ordered his lieutenants to make agreements limiting picketing. Thus, in New England, the U.T.W. leaders, acting under Gorman's orders, made agreements with the mayors, the police chiefs, etc., limiting picketing to six or ten men at a gate. The thousands of textile workers paid no attention to these agreements, but organised their flying squadrons, and went on mass picket lines of as high as ten and fifteen thousand. Similarly in the South, the U.T.W. leaders attempted to stop mass picketing.

Gorman prevented the spread of the strike to Lawrence by calling off the flying squadrons and instructing the strikers not to picket the Lawrence Mills. U.T.W. organiser, Kelly, made an agreement with the Commissioner of Public Safety in Lawrence that no picketing would be carried on there.

The U.T.W. leadership, in the face of murderous terror, agreed to the calling out of troops and publicly attacked mass picketers, who were being shot down as "hoodlums and Communists." Thus we had the spectacle of **Joseph Sylvia**, New England organiser of the U.T.W., inside the Sayles Finishing Company Mills at Saylesville, R.I., conferring with Adjutant General Dean, head of the national guard, while outside the gates troops were shooting down mass picketers. Sylvia came out and urged the pickets to disband and go home. They chased him away with rocks. Sylvia, Riviere and other U.T.W. leaders made statements to the press, washing their hands of the mass picket lines at Woonsocket, Saylesville, and in the South, where workers were killed, and declared the fighting was caused, not by police, deputies and troops, but by "outside agitators" and Communists.

Gorman took the lead in the Red scare campaign. It began in the Hearst press of New England even before the strike, the

"secret open letter" of the Communist Party being put forward as a "plot" to get control of the textile strike. Gorman and his district aides made daily statements to the press against the Communists, in this way trying to stifle all militancy and split off the militant rank and file from the other workers. "Dynamite plots" based on anonymous telephone calls were laid by the Hearst press to Communists. A score were killed by national guard and ex-deputies' bullets, and hundreds wounded. Governor Green of Rhode Island ordered the arrest of every known Communist. Assemblages were forbidden in Rhode Island, where Governor Green applied the Riot Act to the entire State. The militia were now out in four States in New England and almost every Southern State. Concentration camps were set up in Georgia patterned after Hitler's swamps.

But through all this Gorman and Company continued to attack the militant mass picketers and the "Reds" and to praise Roosevelt, and to limit picketing. He was the most potent strike-breaking force which the employers had.

Roosevelt backed up the terror. He went to the extent of assuring Governor Green that federal troops would be called out in Rhode Island as soon as requested, and mobilised the entire U.S. army of New England on a war footing, ready to move at a moment's notice.

In spite of these strike-breaking moves of the employers, the government and the Gorman leadership, the strike was strong and effective when Gorman put over the betrayal. Twenty strikers had been killed or so badly wounded that they later died. But the mass picket lines of the textile workers, in such battles as Woonsocket and Saylesville, charged the national guard after their comrades had been shot down, and forced the closing down of the mills.

After three weeks, Gorman ordered the strikers back to work without a single one of their demands having been granted. He was so anxious to end the strike that he did not even insist on no discrimination, and eighty thousand were locked out of the mills, mostly in the south. Gorman ordered the strikers back to work on the basis of the report of the Winant Board, which had been set up by President Roosevelt to try to end the strike.

The report, which was accepted by Gorman as a "sweeping victory," gives the workers absolutely nothing. The national strike demands were for the thirty-hour week; minimum wages for skilled and semi-skilled as well as unskilled, with higher wages; abolition of the stretch-out; and recognition. Not a single demand was won.

Gorman declared to the A.F. of L. convention that this betrayal was "an amazing victory" for the strikers. The Socialist Party leaders sprang to Gorman's defence and attempted to justify the betrayal. **Norman Thomas** declared: "Gorman and the strike committee did a good job with the resources at their disposal, but those resources were woefully inadequate" ("New Leader," September 29). The **New Leader** in issue after issue, defended Gorman. The October 6 issue continued a full-page anonymous article defending Gorman and attacking the Communists and others for branding his sending back of the workers without any gains as a betrayal.

During the course of the strike the Socialist leaders acted as part and parcel of the Gorman leadership. No criticism was made of Gorman during or after the strike. Emil Rieve, Socialist Party leader and member of the U.T.W. Executive Board and of the Strike Committee, signed the order with Gorman which ended and betrayed the strike. Norman Thomas during the strike, when the terror was raging, refused to enter into a united front in North Carolina "because the Communists were criticising the leadership at the height of the strike."

These Socialist leaders, by refusing to criticise Gorman, by in fact becoming a part of his machine, are equally responsible for the betrayal, for the fact that the workers were unprepared for the sudden sell-out, and were disarmed and unable to continue the struggle, after Gorman's return-to-work order.

As the **Daily Worker** editorials pointed out day after day, the biggest crime of the Gorman leadership was their refusal to mobilise the rest of the working class in support of the textile strike. No attempt was made to build a broad united front against the terror. Instead, the troops were supported by the U.T.W. leaders. Not only the entire A.F. of L. could have been mobilised against the terror, but the broadest masses of the entire working class.

No move was made by Gorman for the collection of financial aid for the strike or for a relief campaign.

The Lovestonite renegades functioned also as part of the Gorman strike-breaking machine. In Paterson, where Eli Keller is manager of the Silk Union (U.T.W.), he carried out the daily instructions of Gorman. He drove the silk workers back to work, even postponing their membership meeting where they were to vote on the back-to-work order of Gorman. He carried out Gorman's orders and kept the dyers from striking. He launched an expulsion policy against the Communists. At the same time that he worked with Gorman as his agent, he launched bitter attacks on the Communist Party in public statements.

The National Textile Workers' Union did everything possible to achieve the unity of the workers and to win the strike. The masses of the workers were in the United Textile Workers' Union, or, if unorganised, were under its leadership. The N.T.W.U. proposed united front steps for one united union and one Strike Committee. The U.T.W. national leadership rejected these proposals and attacked the Communists.

In those places where the Communist Party was strongest, such as Lowell and New Bedford in the North and the Gastonia area in the South, the strike was most militant and most effective. The chief methods whereby the mills were closed, the marches, flying squadrons, and mass picket lines were learned by the workers from the N.T.W.U. and were carried out over the heads of the U.T.W. misleaders. The 1929 Gastonia strike, the previous silk strike, the New Bedford strike, had trained the textile workers in the use of these militant methods.

The Daily Worker played a bigger role in the present strike than it has ever played in previous strikes. It was not only that more than ten thousand copies of the "Daily Worker" went to the strikers every day. The eagerness with which the strikers bought and read the "Daily Worker"; the fact that the correct class struggle line appeared every day in the editorials, and was transmitted to other strikers by readers, affected the course of the strike. The leaflets issued by the "Daily Worker," and the pamphlet containing Comrade Hathaway's editorials in the "Daily Worker," were widely distributed throughout the strike area.

The perspective of the Communist Party that the workers would immediately enter a re-strike movement has been fully borne out. The Paterson silk and dye workers are on the verge of a strike of 30,000 workers at the end of this month. In Pa. and in the South individual mills are striking.

The movement for re-strike is the answer of the workers to Gorman's newest move for betrayal—his immediate acceptance of Roosevelt's "no strike truce." At a time when thousands are black-listed, and when the employers are launching a drive for new wage cuts, Gorman has told the President that the U.T.W. will agree in advance not to strike for a period of six months. Thus, Gorman is trying to make his betrayal permanent and to tie the hands of the textile workers while the fresh attacks of the employers have been launched.

But the conditions under which the one million textile workers have been rebelling for the year and a half of the N.R.A. remain and are getting worse. Wages are being lowered (as in Paterson). The stretch-out is still further increased under Roosevelt's sanction. Jail sentences are doled out to active strikers. Unemployment grows. Discrimination against Negro workers continues. Great struggles will continue in the textile industry.

Paris Lawyer Visits Hertha Kuusinen

Paris, October 28.

The Penal Court at Abo, Finland, passed sentence in August this year on 19 Communists, including the daughter of Kuusinen.

The Paris lawyer, Etienne Milhaud, who went to Helsingfors as representative of the International Juridical Association, obtained permission from the Finnish government to speak to the prisoner and to examine the dossiers of the case. In the presence of an interpreter and a number of prison officials Milhaud was able to hold a long conversation with Hertha Kuusinen, who finally gave him full authority to act on her behalf in the appeal proceedings. The Juridical Association has been informed by Milhaud, who has now returned to Paris, that he has studied the records carefully, but cannot find the slightest proof against Hertha Kuusinen. Her sentence of four years' imprisonment is obviously unjust. Milhaud has sent in a detailed written defence to the Court of Appeal, and will follow the further course of the proceedings.

Fight Against Fascism

U.S. Second Congress Against War and Fascism

By Joe North (New York)

The anti-war and anti-fascist movement is making giant strides in America. It is headed towards attaining actual mass proportions. The second United States Congress Against War and Fascism in Chicago, September 28, 29, 30 proved this. The delegates hitch-hiked, walked, journeyed here in ramshackle autos, from 35 States in the Union. They came from America's semi-colonies, Cuba, Mexico, Canada, too, to hammer out further details in their common programme to stave off fascism, to halt the plans of the war-makers for war.

This movement was born last year at the first U.S. Congress, in New York. At that time, there were 2,616 delegates. They represented slightly less than a million. To-day, the 3,332 delegates were elected by one million eight hundred thousand men, women and youth of all the dispossessed and oppressed classes. The scope of the movement, its rapid growth, heads in the direction of becoming truly a people's movement—one in which all the hard-hit strata of the population can unite on a common minimum programme against their common enemy, monopoly capitalism.

The American section of the anti-fascists, anti-war movement was established as a result of the Amsterdam Congress Against War, called by Henri Barbusse in 1932. It immediately found an important place in the American class struggle. The inherent strength of its programme, its fundamental appeal to the broadest masses, was shown last February, when, as a result of the Madison Square Garden affair, a number of leading socialists withdrew from the national leadership. But not only did the organisation survive, it grew. Last year nine socialist delegates attended; this year 49. The official organ of the League, "Fight," reached a circulation of 30,000.

Two facts were established as a result of the congress:—

(1) The irresistible will of the American masses for united front, for united action against their common enemy.

(2) The beginnings of the breakdown of the Red Scare.

The extent of the united front can be gauged at a glance by the list of the speakers, which included: Louis Perrigaud, secretary of the World Committee Against War and Fascism, and one of the editors of "Le Populaire," the French Socialist daily; Dr. Harry F. Ward, chairman of the American section of the organisation, a professor at the Union Theological Seminary, secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union; Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party; Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld, former Prussian Minister of Justice, member of the Reichstag from 1918 to the time Hitler took power, former member of the Social Democratic Party; General Victor A. Yakhontoff, former Tzarist officer; Robert Morss Lovett, professor at the University of Chicago and president of the League for Industrial Democracy (Socialist); Mrs. Victor Berger, widow of the prominent socialist; Rabbi Benjamin Goldstein; Samuel Patterson, of the League of Struggle for Negro Rights.

Add to these, the longer list of rank and file workers from 35 States, men, women and youth of all political shades and economic beliefs. The credential report shows that 343 represented all types of trade unions, 251 various cultural, educational, middle-class organisations, 434 fraternal organisations (International Workers' Order, Arbeiter Ring, Health Insurance, etc., 247 defence, civil rights, anti-fascist organisations, 25 churches, 22 delegates from shops, 41 from veterans' organisations, 115 from various political parties (Communist, Socialist, Jewish Workers' Party, etc.), 55 from the farms, 193 from anti-war and peace organisations, 121 from women's organisations, 154 from jobless groups.

These diverse elements came and rubbed shoulders with known and avowed Communists; churchmen and A.F. of L. trade unionists heeded the warnings of Earl Browder, secretary of the C.P., U.S.A., and Clarence Hathaway, editor of the "Daily Worker," that greater activity in the ranks of the trade unions was needed. This fact was accepted by all. A drive on the strategic sections of the working class and the A.F. of L. was

charted for the immediate future. And not only that, as Hathaway pointed out, the fight against fascism is no battle to take place on that day when an American Hitler marches on Washington. It is a fight that must be waged day in and day out in defence of all those civil liberties the proletariat had wrested from the bourgeoisie through the many embattled years. And this was recognised by all the League members; by the Y.M.C.A. delegates, the church delegates, the middle-class delegates, as well as the proletarian.

(They proved in action their endorsement of this line by demonstrating, little more than a week after the congress, at the Yankee Stadium in New York, when Governor Lehman spoke under fascist auspices on Columbus Day. Socialists, Communists, non-party workers and petty-bourgeois fought the police, who rode down on them, slashing away with their nightsticks.)

The minimum programme of the League lists as its principal points the following:—

(1) Attempt, through demonstrations, picketing and strikes, to halt the manufacture and transport of munitions.

(2) Expose everywhere the widespread preparations for war carried on under the cloak of national recovery.

(3) Demand all war funds to aid the jobless. Replace all such devices as the C.C.C. (forest camps) by a federal system of social insurance paid for by the government and employers.

(4) Oppose the policies of American imperialism in the Far East, in Latin America, especially now in Cuba, and internationally; support the struggles of all colonial peoples against the imperialist policies of exploitation and armed suppression.

(5) Support the peace policies of the Soviet Union for total and universal disarmament which to-day, with the support of the masses in all lands, constitute the clearest and most effective opposition to war throughout the world; oppose all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union, whether these attempts take the form of misrepresentation and false propaganda, diplomatic manoeuvring or intervention by imperialist governments.

(6) Oppose all developments leading to fascism in this country and abroad, and especially in Germany; oppose the increasingly widespread use of the armed forces against the workers, farmers, and the special terrorising and suppression of Negroes in their attempts to maintain a decent standard of living; oppose the increasing encroachments upon the civil liberties of these groups as a growing fascisation of our allegedly "democratic" government.

(7) Win the armed forces to the support of this programme.

The petty bourgeoisie as well as the proletarian delegates endorsed it and pledged greater activity to carry its injunctions into effect. That this minimum programme should be accepted by widest strata of the middle class was recognised at the Congress in the action of the 49 Socialist delegates, who drew up a resolution. They demanded a united front. They sent it to their national leadership. Furthermore, they demanded that no action be taken against those attending this Congress; expulsion faced them. They demanded their party affiliate with the League. They demanded recognition of the fact that they spoke the will of the Socialist rank and file. They demanded united front with the Communists and all fighting fascism and war.

The appearance at the Congress of delegates from the armed forces—in masks—galvanised the delegates. They were guarded by a defence corps of ex-servicemen, who saw to it that no suspicious-looking characters neared the army delegates. One of the soldiers, a First Lieutenant, reported:—

"The reserve officers of this area have worked out all the details of their mobilisation plans . . . this Congress is our militant answer to these preparations . . . these are not preparations for an imperialist war alone . . . special equipment has been issued and troops at Fort Sheridan have been called out on riot duty . . . these troops can be brought into Chicago within one hour of call . . . from this mighty demonstration we take new courage and we therefore resolve and pledge to this Congress our support in the struggle against war and fascism within the armed forces. . . . And if the capitalists call upon us to wage war, we shall wage war, but against the war makers.

The Congress showed that the old petty bourgeois illusions of pacifism, of non-resistance to war, were being blown sky-high by the explosions in Europe and Asia; by the continued crisis; by the drive toward fascism of the bourgeoisie in every capitalist country of the world.

The First National Congress Against Fascism and War in Mexico

By Vicente Guerna

The first National Congress against Fascism and Imperialist War was held in Mexico from August 23 to 26; 186 organisations, represented by 254 delegates, and 69 organisations, which were unable to send delegates owing to lack of funds, declared their determination to fight in a united front against fascism and imperialist war. The number of toilers represented at this Congress was 200,573, of whom 186,500 belonged to the 186 organisations represented by the delegates present, and 14,773 to the 69 organisations which expressly declared their solidarity with the Congress by telegrams or letters.

The Congress was a great success not only in view of the great number of delegates and organisations represented, but also because it demonstrated the growing radicalisation of the toilers of Mexico and the correctness of the application of the united front tactic of the C.P. of Mexico and of the revolutionary organisations.

Various tendencies were represented at the Congress: pacifists, liberals, Communists, reformists, etc. Among the delegates were workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, artisans, artists, shopkeepers, oppressed natives, etc. Various soldiers' and policemen's committees which could not be represented at the Congress owing to their illegality sent greetings to the Congress and declared their solidarity with its aims.

Despite the sabotage carried out against the Congress by the reformist trade union leaders and the Trotskyist renegades, a number of organisations under their influence disregarded the instructions of their leaders and sent delegates to the Congress. A number of autonomous organisations also sent delegates.

The Congress adopted a number of important resolutions relating to the defence of the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution, solidarity with the revolution in Cuba, and demanding the release of Thaelmann and the anti-fascist prisoners in Germany.

As the fascist organisation, which calls itself the "Revolutionary Mexican Action," intended to hold a parade of its forces on September 15 (the anniversary of the declaration of Mexican independence), the Congress adopted a decision to prepare for a general strike on this day in the event of an attempt being made to hold the parade. On September 15 a declaration by this fascist organisation appeared in some newspapers in the capital to the effect that, in view of the announcement of a general strike and of counter-demonstrations of the "anti-fascists" on September 15, the parade would be abandoned in order not to impart "a Red note" to the national festival. In fact the "Goldshirts" did not parade either on September 15 or 16. This was the first success achieved after the Congress.

The chief danger, however, as the Congress pointed out, is represented by the "Redshirts," which the governor of the Federal State of Tabasco, Garrido Canabal has begun to organise and which represent the movement immediately organised by the government party.

In connection with the facts mentioned above the decision of the Congress to organise anti-fascist guards in all working-class centres and in the workers' organisations is of special importance. A commencement has already been made with the carrying out of this decision in the town of Mexico, and good results have been achieved.

The first National Congress against Fascism and Imperialist War must be a starting point for activity against the advance of fascism and imperialist war. The success achieved in the fight against the Goldshirts proved once again the correctness of the standpoint of the Communist Party of Mexico and of the Communist International that the assertion that fascism must inevitably be victorious everywhere is false.

The Communist Party has also shown that the thesis that in the present period only the ruling classes can decide the question of war and peace, is false. To-day the toiling masses of the whole world are a revolutionary factor which the ruling classes and the imperialists are compelled to take into account. To-day there exists the Soviet Union, which, as the advance-guard of the toiling masses of the whole world and with the support of these masses, constitutes a force which cannot be disregarded by the warmongers. If the working class succeeds in realising its broad

united front by drawing into common action its natural allies, the peasants, the petty bourgeois masses, the students and the intellectuals, the oppressed native peoples (who in Mexico form more than 40 per cent. of the population); then it will not only successfully repel fascism but prevent the letting loose of imperialist war.

The Communist Party of Mexico will have to display tremendous activity in order to realise the revolutionary tasks (the Congress has founded the National League against Fascism and Imperialist War and affiliated to the World Committee) laid down by the first National Congress against War and Fascism.

Letter from Italy

The Idea of Communism Gaining Ground Among the Young Fascists

We publish below, without alteration, a letter from a former member of the Italian Fascist Youth, who recently came over to the Young Communist League. This letter conveys a good idea of the growing discontent among the young fascists.—Ed.

X. . . (Romagna), September.

Dear Comrades,

I should like to deal with and to make some remarks concerning the present organisation of the Fascist Youth, to which, in order to be able to live under this vile regime, I temporarily belonged. Allow me in the first place to make some remarks, based on my observation and experience, regarding the way in which the youth view and judge this, actually, military organisation.

Fascism has of late greatly promoted the organisation of the young fascists and has gone so far as to induce the young people of all social categories to join it in masses. I say "in masses," because in my district, for good or ill, nearly all, if not to say simply all, have been compelled to join.

How has this been accomplished? Promises after promises, free visits to the picture theatres, dances, reading rooms, educational classes on Sunday, etc., were the chief means by which many of these young people were fooled. Finally, force and compulsion for those who remained obstinate. I want you, however, clearly to realise the fact that none of the new members has had the idea or even the firm intention of being a really fascist soldier. The promises, the entertainments had induced them to join the organisation, nothing else. For a certain time everything went more or less smoothly, but when it came to keeping the promises, which had not been fulfilled, discontent began to become general. The Young Communist League made use of this discontent, which took root by penetrating the young "fascists," of whom 75 per cent. belong to the Young Communist League, even if they are still in the Fascio.

This penetration of the ranks of the young fascists is still going on and gives reason to hope for even better results. In this way the strength of the fascist youth in our district, even if it appears to be very great, is very unhealthy (unhealthy for fascism, of course).

One must not, however, give the entire credit for this situation to the Young Communist League, even though I recognise that much credit is due to it. There exists an excitement, I would even say a fever, among the youth, which is shaking it, which causes it to turn its thoughts to new things, to a new ideal in life. When the young people speak of Russia they do so with unusual respect and reverence. As regards myself, I have undergone this change of outlook and am still undergoing it. When politics are discussed the discussion nearly always turns on Russia, and many young fascists speak of an impending class revolution and discuss it with sympathy and eagerness.

They now realise that they have been betrayed. They are now going in the right direction. They have come to realise where their real fatherland is. It is therefore easy to organise them round the flag of Communism. The mistake committed by the hierarchy (enrolment of the masses) of our district has brought advantage to Communism. There is no time to be lost. It is necessary to work, to make use of every opportunity in order to come to the aid of so many young people, victims of fascism, so many young people who are stretching out their arms, seeking a firm point of support by means of which they can raise themselves up, in order to save themselves. Let us go to them, go to their aid! That is our task. Let us bring to them the slogan of the leader of humanity, Lenin. These young people are eagerly awaiting it.

Fascism will attempt to hinder them by means of force, but as they are now inspired with an ideal, even the employment of violent methods will no longer have any chance of success. The way is open. Let us penetrate the ranks of the fascist youth! The young people are seeking a way out. We must lead them, teaching them that the sun which is lighting up the whole world is not Rome, but the Soviet Union, the Russia of Lenin, of Communism.

The White Terror

The Hungarian Fascists Want to Kill Rakosi

"We must win Thaelmann like a battle!"—that is one of the fighting slogans of the world-wide mass movement to save the leader of the Communist Party of Germany. This slogan applies also to Comrade Rakosi, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Hungary, People's Commissar in the first Hungarian Soviet Republic, one of the organisers of the famous Hungarian Red Army, whom fascism still holds in its claws and—of this there is no doubt—intends to kill.

Comrade Rakosi returned to Hungary in order to take a leading part in organising the Communist movement. As a result of a despicable act of treachery he fell into the hands of the police in September, 1925, and twelve months later, in September, 1926, was sentenced to eight and a half years' imprisonment. Already at that time Hungarian fascism demanded Rakosi's head. Rakosi was saved, thanks only to the powerful protest movement which arose in every country.

Eight and a half years' imprisonment! Eight and a half years of isolation, torment, hard labour and hunger! Rakosi, the working-class champion, endured all this. He served the whole of his sentence right up to the last day and was to have been released on April 24, 1934. Hungarian fascism hoped that it would be able to break Comrade Rakosi by means of this monstrous and brutal sentence. But he did not waver for a moment; he remained even while in prison a champion of Communism, who did not abandon his Communist principles one minute. For this reason Hungarian fascism wishes to kill him by means of a fresh sentence. A new trial of Rakosi is being prepared. He is to be charged with 51 "murders," with "forging money," "robbery," seditious incitement and high treason, all of which crimes he is alleged to have committed over 15 years ago as a member of a revolutionary proletarian government. It is the stereotyped lying indictment brought against all leading functionaries of the Soviet State and of the Communist Party. Its "basis" is the death sentences which the revolutionary tribunal pronounced on active counter-revolutionaries, the corpses of counter-revolutionaries who fell with weapons in hand in the fight against the young Soviet power. The fact that the Hungarian Soviet Republic, like any other government, issued its own currency is designated as "forging money"; expropriation of the banks, the factories, the big estates, the fortunes of the bourgeoisie, is described as "robbery"; the setting up of the Soviet dictatorship itself, as seditious incitement and high treason. And, not content with that, Rakosi is not to be brought before an ordinary court, but before a kind of Summary Court, a senatorial court, which will deal with the case "expeditiously."

Hungarian fascism has its own peculiarity. It still wears a sort of "democratic" garb: it still has its "parliament," its "political parties," its "independent judiciary." It does not say, like German fascism: "Right is that which is of advantage to the national socialist state," but is still guided by "generally valid" principles of justice.

But what is the reality behind this camouflage?

The Hungarian government's treatment of Rakosi is unprecedented even when regarded from a purely formal judicial standpoint. According to Hungarian law, a common criminal, when two separate charges are brought against him, must be brought to trial on account of the second crime during the time he is serving his sentence for the first crime. Hungarian law expressly prescribes that in such cases the two sentences must not simply be added, but must run concurrently. But that which applies in the case of an ordinary criminal does not apply in the case of a Communist. It would have been quite possible to have

tried Rákosi, under the law for the protection of the State, eight and a half years ago, not only on account of his organisational and propagandist activity in the C.P. of Hungary, but also on account of his activity in the Hungarian Commune. The Public Prosecutor, the Court, the government neglected to do so at that time. Eight and a half years after it suddenly occurs to them that Rákosi was not only an organiser of the C.P. of Hungary during the ten months of his illegal activity, but was also a People's Commissar at the time of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

The arbitrary manner in which the Hungarian judicial authorities disregard their own laws has aroused consternation even among bourgeois jurists. When it first became known that a new case was being framed up against Rákosi the "Az Est" wrote:—

"Great excitement prevails among Hungarian lawyers on account of the unprecedented case where a prisoner, after having served a sentence of eight and a half years' imprisonment, can be sentenced to death at a new trial."

What do the Hungarian rulers care about that! They have done worse things than this. They know how to distinguish between "murder" and murder, between "robbery" and robbery when it is a question of defending their own interests. Here are a few facts to prove this. After the overthrow of the Hungarian Soviet power a number of the best leaders of the C.P. of Hungary were hanged on the same grounds on which Rákosi is to be brought to trial again. "Punitive expeditions," military detachments of the counter-revolution murdered hundreds and hundreds of workers and peasants, and nothing whatever was done to them. The formula usually employed in order to justify all these atrocious deeds was: They were committed out of "righteous indignation," out of "patriotic feelings." But there was one thing that rather spoils this "argument": the white bandits not only murdered but also robbed their victims. And the white bandits murdered not only workers and poor peasants, but also rich Jews in order to plunder them. The notorious detachment of Ivan Héjjas waded not only in workers' blood. In the months of September-November, 1919, it murdered and robbed no less than 64 bourgeois. On the basis of an amnesty decree all the murderers went unpunished. The members of a second notorious terrorist detachment, the Babarczy detachment, who regularly extorted money from rich Jews, were likewise amnestied. The white terrorists Ladislaus Hly and George Rigoczky made a raid on the "Club" café in Budapest, which is frequented by many Jews. They killed three people, and for this were condemned to 13 and 12 years' imprisonment respectively. These terrorists were also amnestied later; they had killed only "Jews."

The white murderers and robbers were directly encouraged by government bodies. Thus the Minister for Defence, Count Karl Csáky, in an interview on the question who would be amnestied, expressed the following opinion:—

"If, before the murder, the perpetrator was actuated by the following motives: I can do with Somogyi's gold watch (Somogyi was the editor of the social-democratic "Nepszava," who together with his colleague Bacso, was kidnapped and cruelly murdered by white terrorists—Ed.), then he cannot be amnestied in any case. But if it turns out that he acted not from selfish but political motives, then he is entitled to be amnestied, even if he afterwards appropriated Somogyi's watch. In other words: the decisive question is the motive which prompted the murderer."

Edmund Benitzky, former Minister for the Interior, who was in opposition to the government at that time, declared in parliament that in the year 1921 he submitted a petition to Prime Minister Count Bethlen enumerating 94 cases of atrocities committed by the white bands, cases which were connected with robbery and extortion. Count Bethlen, however, had more urgent business than to prosecute murderers and robbers.

Were these acts of murder only "regrettable excesses" committed in the first years after the overthrow of the Soviet dictatorship, as was later officially announced? These acts of murder did not cease during the period of "consolidation." White terrorists threw bombs into a meeting of the Jewish Women's Association in Csongrad. Result: three killed, 23 seriously wounded. White terrorists committed a bomb outrage against the Democratic Association of Erszébetvaros, a suburb of Budapest. Result: 8 killed, 21 seriously wounded. The perpetrators did not even need an amnesty, they were acquitted straight away by the judges!

In the meantime Communists and revolutionary workers were arrested and thrown into the torture chambers of the police stations and prisons. Their repeated hunger strikes were always brutally crushed by the cruel prison management. The participants in such hunger strikes were severely punished in order to serve as a warning. Comrade Rákosi himself, who contracted lung and heart trouble in prison during his eight and a half years' imprisonment, carried out six hunger strikes, covering altogether 54 days. He passed a third of his prison term, i.e., three years, under disciplinary punishment. And this campaign to exterminate the Communists was "crowned" in the year 1932 by the execution of our two comrades, Sallai and Fuerst, on account of mere organisational and propaganda work. In the whole world there was only one opinion regarding this monstrous crime of Hungarian fascism: abominable murder!

This is the true countenance of Hungarian fascism. This is the gang to whom Comrade Rákosi is delivered over. And this gang is now attempting to adopt a democratic pose. Its representatives declared a few days ago that they granted right of asylum to the Marseilles assassins, provided them with weapons and false passports, because Hungary respects the right of freedom, like all "civilised" States. No mercy for our Comrade Rákosi can be expected from this gang. Hungarian fascism is out to destroy Rákosi because he is an indomitable class fighter, a symbol of the emancipation struggle of the Hungarian workers and poor peasants. Hungarian fascism wants to kill Rákosi in order to intimidate the Hungarian proletariat which is defending itself against oppression and exploitation, resorting to the weapon of the strike, political actions, etc. Rákosi can only be saved by the mass struggle of the working class. To strengthen this fight in all countries is the call of the hour.

A Cry for Help From Spain

We are convinced that you are following with burning interest and enthusiasm the bold resistance of the Asturian miners against the armed forces of the government. And we are equally convinced that the news of the seizure of land by the indescribably poor and exploited peasants in various parts of Spain, and the establishment of workers' and peasants' Soviets, as, for instance, in the Basque towns of Eibar and Mondragon, meets with your full approval, and is inspiring many thousands of the toiling masses all over the world with enthusiasm and fighting courage.

But these struggles are costing the lives of thousands of workers; the Spanish soil is red with the blood of workers and peasants. In Asturias alone 15,000 soldiers, armed to the teeth and equipped with the most up-to-date of weapons of war, were sent to crush the insurrection. In one single barricade fight in Asturias 150 workers were killed. In Madrid 200 workers had been killed and wounded, 300 taken prisoner, two days after the general strike was declared. The town of Gijon, which was in the hands of the insurgents, was bombarded by the warship "Libertad" on the orders of the minister in Madrid, and hundreds of workers were killed and wounded. In Leon, a rallying point of the miners, hundreds were massacred, and hundreds more wounded. In Catalonia over 500 were wounded, and more than one hundred killed.

Thousands of families and orphans are left completely destitute. Mass arrests are being made all over Spain, and there are not enough prisons to hold the arrested, so that they are being herded like cattle into improvised concentration camps.

Courts martial are being held, and a number of death sentences have already been passed. It is impossible to ascertain the numbers of murdered and wounded workers, nor the number of families who have lost their breadwinners.

The Spanish Section of the I.R.A. has remained at its post from the first moment onwards. We know that it is our duty to bring prompt aid to thousands of prisoners, thousands of families and children of the dead revolutionaries. We are exerting our utmost efforts, we are calling upon the toiling masses everywhere to aid us in the tremendous task, for without aid we cannot carry it out. **We need your help!**

In the names of the heroic Spanish workers and peasants who have given their lives in the struggle against fascism, we appeal to the toiling masses of the world to aid us in our task.

In Spain the socialists, the anarchists, and the Communists have fought side by side against their class enemies. Carry out your solidarity action on the same broad basis of the united front of all workers, and of all organisations of the toiling masses.

The Spanish Section of the I.R.A.

Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution

On the Eve of the Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution

(Leading Article of "Pravda," October 26th, 1934)

Another year of the great October Socialist Revolution is passing into history. Another heroic page has been turned and another brilliant chapter finished.

October, the October of the grim year 1917! It will always be a source of the greatest revolutionary inspiration, will always give strength and energy in the struggle for the new world, for the socialist fatherland. In the tempests and flames of the armed rebellion of the working class arose the Soviet power, the dictatorship of the proletariat. The red star of Communism rose over the world. Under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of the great generals of the proletarian revolution, Lenin and Stalin, the workers and peasants seized the power. They obtained a fatherland, they became the masters of their own fate and of their own life.

The entire capitalist world joined its forces to crush and strangle the young proletarian State. The best that was among the toiling people, among the working class and the peasantry rose to defend the gains of the October Revolution by force of arms. The country was surrounded by the fronts of the civil war. From the Polish frontier to Vladivostok, on the Volga, in the steppes of the Ukraine, on the Black Sea, the Baltic Sea, the White Sea, at the approaches to Moscow and Petrograd, bloody battles were fought for the power of the Soviets, for Socialism.

The working class and the toiling peasants won the victory, led, organised, inspired and armed by the Communist Party, by Lenin and Stalin, these giants of humanity liberated from the chains of oppression. Devastated by imperialist war and intervention, the country began the work of construction. The fighters returned from the front to semi-ruined factories, in order to breathe the new life into them. The first stones were laid in the foundation on which arose the great edifice of socialist industry and collectivised agriculture.

How the mighty Soviet country has been built up! Look to the east, the west, the south, the north! Coal is being dug, metal smelted, new machines made. Collective farms and State farms are filling the elevators and barns with grain. The menacing squadrons of the Red air fleet soar over the country. The frontiers of the boundless country are girdled with a steel Bolshevik chain of the best technique of defence and the best people, the heroic sons of the socialist fatherland.

The seventeenth year will enter the chronicles of the revolution as a year of the further strengthening of the Soviet Union, as a year of tremendous growth in the strength and importance of the Soviet country on the international scene. The courageous fight of the Soviet Union for peace finds an echo not only among the millions of toilers of capitalist countries, but also among the governments of foreign countries which are desirous of maintaining peace at the present moment for various reasons. This is shown, among other things, by the invitation to the U.S.S.R. to join the League of Nations.

The year 1934 is a remarkable year in the sphere of the development of national economy. Judging by all indications, heavy industry will completely fulfil the gigantic plan of the second year of the second Five Year Plan. This year the Soviet blast furnaces will produce three million tons of iron more than in 1933. This figure should be pondered over to understand the power which is to be found in socialist heavy industry.

The present year in the U.S.S.R. is also distinguished by improvements in quality. The new culture is laying a wide path for itself. The workers have begun to work better, more reliably with greater knowledge and experience. People have grown in stature both in town and village. And the growth of people, of cadres, is the truest indication of the strength of the new social order. The crews of the Chelyuskin and the Litke, and especially

the airmen who rescued the Chelyuskinites, showed the granite out of which the revolutionary generation of the Soviet Union is carved.

The year 1934 was marked by the education of new heroes of great and small matters. The numbers of the shock-workers are multiplying more and more. The shock-workers in the villages are especially strengthening the new collective farm system economically and organisationally! The strength of the collective farm system has been tested once more in the difficulties which were met with in some districts owing to the dry weather at the beginning of the summer. And it was shown both in times of difficulty and joy that the collective farms, and only the collective farms, lead to a well-to-do life.

The year 1934 began with the Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., and ends with the elections to the Soviets. The policy set out at the Seventeenth Congress in the report of Comrade Stalin was warmly supported and conducted in practice by tens of millions of the toilers of the Soviet Union. They are sending to the Soviets—the organs of the proletarian dictatorship—the best people of the working class, of the collectivised peasants and the Soviet intellectuals, in order to carry the development of the socialist revolution further and further ahead with still greater energy and brilliance. The beginning of the elections to the Soviets coincides with the seventeenth anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. A golden chain stretches from the taking of the Winter Palace, from the shots of the "Aurora" to the Seventh Congress of Soviets.

The country of the Soviets is preparing to celebrate the anniversary of the socialist revolution. On November 7 the toiling people of the U.S.S.R., firmly welded, united under the Red banner of socialism, will demonstrate their strength, socialist order and supreme loyalty to their Party, its Leninist Central Committee, led by Comrade Stalin.

Under the banner of the October Socialist Revolution and under its slogans, our militant comrades abroad will also demonstrate on this day. The truth of October will sound out still more loudly in the fascist countries, in all the proletarian centres of the world, drenched in the blood of the workers and peasants, in the places where the toilers suffer from capitalist barbarity and the brutality of the military who are preparing for new wars. And throughout the world still more strongly will sound the cry: **Workers of the world, unite!**

The Achievements of the Second Year of the Second Five Year Plan

The national economy of the Soviet Union has entered the fourth quarter of the second year of the second Five-Year Plan. The chief and decisive branches of socialist economy have entered this quarter with record figures, both as regards quantity and quality.

In the first three quarters of the current year the heavy industry of the Soviet Union increased its production by 28-29 per cent., compared with the first three quarters of the previous year. The non-ferrous metal industry, which in former years failed to keep pace with other branches of national economy, is this year working on a particularly high level. In the first three quarters of the present year the smelting of pig iron amounted to 75 per cent. of the annual plan, and showed an increase of 49.7 per cent., in comparison with last year. Coke production increased by 40.6 per cent., compared with last year, iron ore production by 49.1 per cent. and steel smelting by 42.6 per cent.

The output of light industry has increased month by month, both as regards quantity and quality. The demand of the popula-

tion of the Soviet Union for articles of general consumption is being better satisfied, although this demand is increasing every day owing to the continually rising standard of living of the working population.

The results of the first three quarters of the present year are evidence of the enormous achievements of socialist economy and the possibilities of further achievements. In view of these results we have every reason to believe that the great economic plan of the second year of the Second Five-Year Plan will be completely fulfilled.

On the seventeenth anniversary of the October revolution it will first be possible to sum up the agricultural achievements in the year 1934. In the meantime, however, there is every indication that in regard to agriculture the present year will surpass last year with its record harvests.

The drought which occurred in the spring of this year embraced the whole of the Union in April and May. It was due only to the collective farm system, with the unexampled enthusiastic work of the collective farm peasants in combating the fatal effects of the drought and a whole number of sowing measures, which can be carried out only by big socialised undertakings, that it was possible to avert the danger of the grain crops being dried up. As a result the harvest, taken as a whole, is not worse and in fact in many districts is even better than the record harvest of 1933.

This year a considerable number of the collective farms in the Central Volga district, which usually suffer more than other districts from drought, are able to record a bigger harvest than that of any preceding years. The fields in the Asov Black Sea region and the Crimea, which at first looked as if they would not yield any harvest whatever, provided excellent crops to the collective peasants. In the Central Asiatic Republics the harvests in many places were larger than have been known for half a century. The Moscow district, the Ural and Siberia are able to record very good harvests. The best collective farms in the Moscow district, for example, yielded 20 and even 22 cwt. of winter wheat, which previously had not been sown here at all.

In judging the results of the agricultural year 1934 it is very important to keep in mind that the State sowing plan for all the main varieties of grain in the Soviet Union was exceeded. This applies to summer wheat (over one million hectares more than the plan), and to oats (over 900,000 hectares more than the plan). The plan for the cultivation of barley was also exceeded (about 200,000 hectares).

The victories achieved by socialist agriculture in the year 1934 are due in the first place to the incomparable advantages of collective farming. One of the factors contributing to these victories was the early sowing which it was possible to carry out, thanks to the great efficiency of the collective farms, which are served by machine and tractor stations. The most striking example of an early conclusion of spring sowing was the sowing of sugar beets this year. The whole of the Ukraine concluded the sowing of sugar beets in April. The result is a rich harvest.

The collective farms have already performed a vast amount of preliminary work in preparation for next year's harvest. The autumn ploughing plan was increased from 36.5 to 41.8 million hectares this year. The importance of autumn ploughing is generally recognised. The land which has been ploughed in the autumn absorbs moisture. Summer sowing after autumn ploughing results as a rule in a higher harvest yield. The rich harvest in the Volga district, in Western Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union this year is due in no small measure to the autumn ploughing carried out last year.

Autumn ploughing, which was not usual before the rise of the collective farms, has become one of the best means of combating drought. According to the latest figures, by October 15, autumn ploughing had been carried out on 20.5 million hectares of land. This year's winter sowing campaign is proceeding incomparably better and more speedily than in all former years. By October 15 last, the winter grain sowing plan in the whole of the Union has already been fulfilled 92 per cent.—34,533,000 hectares have been sown, whilst last year only 31,700,000 hectares had been sown by this time.

The successes achieved by the collective and Soviet farms this year are bound to have an effect on the grain procuring. The State grain provision plan for the whole of this year will be fulfilled before its time. By October 15 the grain procuring plan for the whole year was fulfilled 94.9 per cent., whilst the collective

farms had fulfilled their plan 97.9 per cent. By this date last year the plan was fulfilled only 83.8 per cent. The monthly plan for October was fulfilled 56.8 per cent. by October 15.

The grain purchases of the State and co-operative organisations are proceeding successfully as a result of the big grain surpluses which the collective peasants have at their disposal. These purchases already exceed the State grain procuring plan. By October 15 these organisations had already procured 50 million poods of grain, of which 15 million poods were obtained from the Ukraine and the Moscow district. All these figures show that this year the collective farm peasants made great progress on the way to a life of prosperity and culture.

Genoa 1922—Geneva 1934

By D. Saslavski

Europe of the year 1922 can be judged by *Genoa*. In the spring of that year the most eminent representatives of the ruling bourgeoisie, the most brilliant diplomats and learned economists met together in this town. They took their places in the grand hall according to their rank and dignity. At the principal table—the French, English, Belgians, Italians and Japanese. The Entente in visible form. It still exists. *Lloyd George* and *Barthou* stand at its head in this hall. They are the masters. English and French capital still go arm-in-arm as the first married couple. They are followed by Italy, Belgium and Japan. The rest of the victor countries form a motley group. Quite at the rear, looking very meek and humble, are Germany and Austria.

It is no longer a secret to anybody that the leading married couple are no longer living in harmony with one another. Bourgeois England and bourgeois France are like a husband and wife who have a family quarrel every day, who hate each other, but yet cannot decide to have a divorce. They cannot have a formal separation, because post-war Europe belongs to both of them and they are unable to come to an agreement for peaceful division of the spoils.

Although there is no war there nevertheless does not exist that peace for which the international bourgeoisie longed. Fat profits must now be reaped from the fields fertilised with the blood of millions of toilers, but the harvest is still relatively very meagre. The severe crisis of the post-war time weighs down on the world in the form of inflation, unemployment, decline of internal and foreign trade, and general misery. Germany lies prone at the feet of the victors: here I am, feed on my flesh! Drink my blood! The representatives of the German social democracy are ready, like eager and obsequious cooks, to serve up to the masters of Europe any dish they desire. But there is nothing left of Germany but skin and bone. It is unable to satisfy the gluttonous masters of Europe. In fact it is starving itself. It must first be thoroughly nourished in order that it shall be able to pay reparations. But who will feed it with credits, and how?

An enticing picture hovers before the greedy eyes of this choice assembly: The vast lands of Russia with its millions of peasants, its immeasurable fields, its rich coal deposits and oil fields. Here all of them could do profitable business. And each one keeps a jealous watch on the others in order that one of the pack shall not be the first to pounce upon Russia, keep it for itself, grab the best portion. Hence the united front of the capitalist countries, the general boycott of Soviet Russia in the sense of an agreement not to recognise it, not to trade with it and not to grant it any credits.

That Russia as the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat is perishing, of that none of them doubts. For the States gathered in Genoa its collapse is only a question of time. The idea of overthrowing Russia by means of armed force has had to be abandoned. The working class has repelled the intervention, driven out the armies of the allies, and only the last remnants of the Japanese occupation troops are still clinging tightly to the coast districts. The differences of opinion regarding when the collapse of the Bolsheviki will take place now form the subject of family disputes in the Anglo-French marriage.

Lloyd George and other liberal Englishmen believe that this collapse will not take place for some time, therefore one must not wait any longer, but fleece Russia somewhat. This must be done at once in order to promote English trade and English industry, in order to secure the best plums in Russia. Lloyd George therefore is in favour of negotiations with Soviet Russia.

France, however, in the person of Barthou, will not hear of this. He sits in Genoa like a peevish lady and will have nothing

to do with these hated Bolsheviks. For the rest, it is not worth while talking with them, for we know quite well—Soviet Russia will collapse to-morrow. And if not to-morrow, then at any rate the day after. . . .

There is an icy silence in the hall as the Bolsheviks, headed by Comrade Litvinov, appear. Not a friendly glance. Nobody offers them his hand even out of politeness. It is the first official appearance of the Bolsheviks in the world of European diplomacy. They are not even recognised. They are regarded officially as something which must disappear. Nevertheless, for the first time the imperialist diplomats and statesmen are compelled to speak with them face to face. And they proceed to talk with the Bolsheviks as with criminals, who have to show their repentance, abandon their programme and show that they are "decent" people in the bourgeois sense of the word.

But the Bolsheviks do not look at all like criminals. Already after their first speeches the capitalist press raises a great outcry about their "impudence" and "audacity." They do not think of repenting, of abandoning their programme, etc. They say: we come to Genoa as business people—we are prepared to trade and bargain. You need Russia in order to revive your capitalist economy; we need you in order to promote our Soviet economy. Let us trade and bargain.

This behaviour was something absolutely new and unheard of in the capitalist world. With some it aroused laughter, whilst others were astounded. And even among the proletarians there were some who did not immediately understand this attitude. To many terribly "Left" Communists it seemed that Soviet Russia was proving unfaithful to its principle, that it wanted to surrender the achievements of the revolution to the class enemy.

In Moscow Lenin calmly refutes all these objections of people who do not understand the New Economic Policy of Russia. In alliance with the poor peasants, with the support of the middle peasants, the working class has defeated all its enemies and obtained complete possession of political power. But the achievements of the revolution are threatened if the working class do not soon reconstruct industry and establish a firm foundation of Socialism. It is therefore necessary to overcome the economic decline caused by the imperialist war and intervention. The working people have no capital of their own. The cadres of the industrial proletariat are still relatively small. It is necessary to revive trade and industry at all costs. In order to achieve this, however, it is necessary to retreat somewhat, to dig oneself in in the captured positions, secure the key positions of national economy, cede a definite part, however, to private capital, but under the strict control of the proletariat. Private capital must be made use of in the interests of the proletarian revolution. This is a new and difficult undertaking, but the Communists are quite capable of carrying it out.

The Soviet power is prepared to grant industrial and trading concessions. And Lenin warned the capitalists, when he displayed the strong and the weak sides of Soviet Russia: "Enough! No more concessions! Enough! To-morrow you will not receive anything more!"

These were the instructions which the Soviet delegates brought with them to Genoa. They categorically declared: There can be no question of restoring private property in Russia. The handing back of the mines, factories, workshops, etc., to their former capitalist owners is absolutely out of the question. The whole labour protection legislation in Soviet Russia remains in force. But here we make you an advantageous offer: concessions for a definitely limited period, factories which are at a standstill, natural resources in various parts of Soviet Russia; build up and develop them. The former proprietors will receive preference, but they will only hold their former undertakings as concessionaires, for a definite time. Soviet Russia does not refuse to compensate to a certain extent these former owners for the damage caused by the revolution, but on condition that credits are granted which will enable the Soviet power to restore its national economy.

These, in the main, were the proposals of the Soviet delegation in Genoa, 1922. The capitalists of all countries heard the proposals of the Soviet government. But they failed to hear Lenin's warning: "To-morrow you will get nothing more what-

ever!" They were convinced, on their part, that to-morrow they would get everything back: above all their factories, their undertakings. The main point of the negotiations was the *restitution*, in plain language, the restitution of private property, the voluntary conversion of the Soviet Union in a country in which the imperialists should enjoy the same privileges as they do in China, India, or other colonial countries. In Genoa and at the *Hague* the capitalists of France, England and Belgium came forward on behalf of the former private property owners in Tsarist Russia. They insistently demanded: give us back the factories and the capital of which the revolution has robbed us. The European bourgeoisie displayed tremendous greed and also incredible blindness. They absolutely failed to realise the meaning of events in Russia.

Formally regarded, the Genoa Conference remained without result. No agreement was arrived at. Soviet Russia received neither credits nor capital. But the united front of boycotters was broken. The capitalists in the various countries impatiently awaited the failure of the Conference in order to compete with each other with offers of goods, with negotiations on trading relations with Soviet Russia.

Since then twelve years have passed, and, greeted with loud applause, the representatives of the Soviet Union entered the crowded session hall of the League of Nations. They are given a seat on the Council of the League. Many of the statesmen present were present at the Genoa Conference. Lloyd George is missing. But also the English Conservatives are compelled with rueful mien to tolerate Soviet Russia among the Powers which decide the fate of the world. Fascist Germany and predatory Japan cannot conceal their feelings of bitter hatred. The Soviet Union frustrates their dirty game. The representatives of France, who twelve years ago in Genoa behaved like peevish anti-Bolshevik ladies, now come forward as the best friends of the Soviet Union among the bourgeoisie.

Twelve years ago the Bolsheviks were very little intimidated by the hostility of the bourgeoisie. To-day they are still less impressed by their outward politeness and friendliness. The Soviet Union enters the world arena as a first-class Power. Who would venture to talk to-day of the overthrow of the Bolsheviks? Serious politicians do not waste their time on such nonsense; they leave it to the gutter press. Lloyd George is more or less in retirement, whilst Litvinov carries on politics on a world scale, and everybody knows that it is a policy which is in the interests of the world proletariat.

The proletariat of the Soviet Union has only itself and the international proletariat to thank for its strength. The capitalists, as Lenin predicted, received nothing. Exerting their forces to the utmost, without foreign credits, without any aid from the capitalists, the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union built up their economy—a socialist economy and at the same time the strongest and most unshaken economy in the whole world. The former private property owners no longer venture even to mention the restitution of the private property in the U.S.S.R. The socialist system has not only won recognition, but proved to be a system whose advantages have caused numerous bourgeois economists to puzzle their brains. The Soviet Union has remained untouched by the world economic crisis. Unemployment is known only in the capitalist countries.

The dark clouds of imperialist war are again gathering on the horizon. The bourgeois governments want war and fear it at the same time. They are hastily hunting for allies of every kind in anticipation of the approaching conflict. Some want war more than they fear it, others fear it more than they want it. Uncertainty and unrest prevail in the whole of the capitalist world. The Soviet Union does not want war, but is also not afraid of it. This is one of the things which distinguishes it from all the capitalist States. Its policy is clear and consistent. It will—to use Comrade Stalin's words—make use of every factor, however small, tending to prevent war, in order to secure peace. And if the League of Nations is such a factor, then the Soviet Union will not fail to make use of it. The question of peace and war is hovering in the balance. The Soviet Union is throwing its whole weight into the scale of peace. The Soviet Union is protecting millions of toilers from the horrors of war, just as it is defending the inviolability of its frontiers.

Appeal of the International Red Aid for November 7

Toilers in town and country!

On the seventeenth anniversary of the October Revolution, your eyes, the thoughts of the workers of all countries, of all the oppressed nationalities and colonial peoples are turned to the Soviet Union. With the great example of socialist construction in the country of the proletarian dictatorship before your eyes, you have this year conducted great fights.

The productive forces of the socialist fatherland have increased enormously. Gigantic works like the huge Uralmash works and the Kramatorsk engineering works, built up on the basis of the most modern technique, are supplying the country with plant and equipment for whole factories. The collectivisation of agriculture, the bankruptcy of which the bourgeois world so often predicted, already embraces two-thirds of the working population. It is thanks only to collectivisation that the drought was overcome this year and a rich harvest brought in. The material and cultural situation of the peasants in the collective farms to-day cannot be compared with their situation two or three years ago.

The achievements in the sphere of culture are enormous. Cinemas, theatres, scientific institutions are springing up even in the most remote villages of the Soviet country. Thirty million toilers in the Soviet Union to-day are being educated at the cost of the State.

This is possible only in a country where the rule of the proletariat means real freedom for all toilers. The bourgeois world, which in past years attempted with lies and calumny to depreciate the great work of socialist construction, is to-day compelled to admit the tremendous achievements realised in the course of the first Five-Year Plan.

You toilers in all countries have in the course of this year become acquainted with the great acts of solidarity performed by the working masses of the Soviet Union. Think of the solidarity shown by the Soviet proletariat to the fighting Austrian workers! Remember that it was the Soviet Union which immediately afforded the right of asylum to the Austrian Schutzbundlers and has created a second home for all persecuted revolutionary fighters.

On the seventeenth anniversary of the October Revolution, on which the successes of socialist construction, the superiority of the socialist system are becoming more and more obvious, the danger of war is more threatening than ever. Imperialist Japan on the one hand and Hitler Germany on the other are the countries which are feverishly arming for a war against the socialist fatherland, your fatherland. Strong forces are at work also in England, Poland and Finland in order to draw these countries into active war preparations against the Soviet Union. The Kuomintang is endeavouring to annihilate Soviet China. A war can break out at any moment also on the frontiers of the other capitalist States.

The terror against the workers, peasants and intellectuals in the capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries is being intensified enormously. With methods of vile murder, "shooting while attempting to escape," torture, etc., you are to be rendered docile for a new imperialist war. It is intended by such methods to break your resistance to increased exploitation, fascism, the war danger, and the attacks of the employers.

Progress and prosperity on one-sixth of the globe, in the country of socialist construction—misery, hunger, privation and unemployment in the capitalist world. This is the situation in which you workers of all countries are celebrating the seventeenth anniversary of the proletarian revolution on one-sixth of the globe.

The example of the toilers in the Soviet Union shows you the **only way out of crisis and war** and serves to spur you on in your fights, in the formation of the fighting united front against imperialism and the danger of war.

On November 7, the day of the victory of the socialist world over the capitalist world, which is doomed to perish, we call to you:—

Create the fighting united front for the defence of the Soviet Union! Let your fighting flags display the slogan:—

Freedom for **Ernst Thaelmann** and all imprisoned anti-fascists!

Freedom for **Rakosi**, the **Rueggs**, for **Gramsci** and the **Scottsboro Negro boys**!

Strengthen the solidarity actions for the victims of the white terror and fascism! Let your powerful protest be heard against

the persecution of political emigrants! Demand full right of asylum for revolutionary fighters who are driven from country to country! Down with fascism and war! Down with the capitalist reign of terror!

Long live the Soviet Union, the fatherland of all toilers!

Long live Soviet China!

Long live international solidarity!

Long live the International Red Aid!

Executive Committee of the International Red Aid.

In the International

The C.P. of Yugoslavia on the Assassinations in Marseilles

The C.C. of the C.P. of Yugoslavia has sent a circular to all district committees of the Party defining the attitude of the Party to the Marseilles assassinations and laying down the tasks of the Party. In this circular it is stated:—

The death of King Alexander will have such foreign and domestic political consequences that it is necessary to make a thorough analysis of these questions.

(1) Appraisal of the Assassination

Our Party had, on several occasions, most emphatically dissociated itself from individual terrorist actions. On the occasion of the attempt on the life of King Alexander by Stejitch in the year 1920, on the occasion of the attempt on the life of Drashkovitch, Minister for the Interior, by Alijagitch in the year 1921, and on the occasion of several other assassinations (the murder of Schlegel, various bomb outrages by the Croat fascists, etc.) up to the present day, our Party, in full agreement with the Marxist-Leninist teachings of the class struggle, has, in Party decisions and documents, publicly and consistently condemned the method of individual terror. Consistently following this teaching, the Communist Party dissociates itself from this latest assassination of Alexander. The Communists have no reason to mourn for Alexander, the main bearer and main representative of the hated military-fascist regime. But the Communist teaching of the class struggle, our scientific Marxist conviction and the international experience of the class struggle, show us that individual actions cannot take the place of the struggle of the classes and the struggle of the oppressed masses, that the killing of one or other representative of the oppressive power cannot lead to the elimination of exploitation and oppression, and that therefore isolated terrorist actions are not only useless but harmful. Such actions are harmful for the following reasons:—

(a) They spread illusions among the masses that the struggle of individuals or selected groups can replace the struggle of the masses; they lead the masses into passivity, to await their salvation and emancipation from individual heroes, and do not rouse them to fight for their own emancipation.

(b) They divert the discontent, the hatred and the resistance of the masses to the wrong path of struggle against individuals, the most prominent representatives and bearers of the oppressing class, and not against the class as a whole, not against the whole system of the ruling class.

(c) They cost unnecessary sacrifices and enable the oppressors to justify before the broad masses, which are opposed to individual terror, the increased terror and the persecution of the revolutionary and national emancipation movements, the arrest and murder of hundreds of their best representatives.

(d) They divert the activity of individual, sincere and self-sacrificing adherents of the revolutionary movement from work among the masses to futile conspirative activity, and thereby weaken the positive activity of the militant elements among the masses.

(e) They bring grist to the mill of the imperialists of the neighbouring countries and create favourable conditions for the work of various provocateurs and adventurers who are interested in bringing about warlike complications.

Especially at the present time the fascist provocateurs are making use of the means of individual terror and murder, as is proved by a whole number of cases (the murder of Dollfuss, a whole series of assassinations committed by the national socialists, murder of Doumer).

(To be concluded)

Trade Union Movement

Questions of the International Trade Union Movement*

By O. Piatnitzki

Question: Is it now necessary to make special efforts in the work of the revolutionary trade unions to establish a trade union united front and trade union unity?

Answer: Undoubtedly yes. The Communists have always insisted on this necessity, but the new factor in the present situation is that the workers in the reformist, independent, Catholic and other trade union organisations are beginning to be convinced of this necessity also. This means that there is now a greater chance for the establishment of trade union unity than was formerly the case.

Great masses of the workers are now beginning to sum up the results of two distinct policies. The one is the policy of reformism, the policy of class harmony, the policy which has flung the working classes of a number of countries back half a century in their development, both economically and politically. The second is the policy of a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie as conducted by the Communists for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The first policy has led directly into fascist slavery, even in a country like Germany, where the working class was particularly strongly organised. The second policy was the policy of the October revolution, and it has led to the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The disappointment of ever greater masses of the working class in all capitalist countries with the first policy, the reformist policy, and the tremendous successes which have been gained by the revolutionary policy, have caused increasing numbers of workers to demand unity of action with their Communist fellow workers, to demand the establishment of a united working-class front and trade union unity.

Naturally, it is much more difficult to obtain trade union unity than it is to set up a working-class united front. Already we have seen the united front in action in individual questions or groups of questions and for limited periods. However, trade union unity demands organisational unity. It must also be taken into consideration that in any case the trade union movement is very split up, and that it takes on various forms and develops various tendencies in the various countries. The result is that it is quite impossible to obtain trade union unity according to a uniform plan applicable to all countries in the same fashion. We must proceed from the practical situation which exists in each particular country in order to carry on our struggle for trade union unity, both outside and in particular inside the reformist and reactionary trade union organisations.

Question: Have any essential alterations taken place in the objective situation influencing our application of the united front tactic and our fight for trade union unity, or are we now repairing errors in the previous application of our united front policy (tactic of the united front from below) and thus improving our leadership of the spontaneous movement of broad masses of the workers in favour of unity?

Answer: In comparison with the period of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International and the Fifth Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions, there have undoubtedly been great alterations in the working class and in the working-class movement. After the temporary defeat of the working-class movement in Germany, in January, 1933, and the disintegration of the German social democracy, and in particular after the events of February, 1934, in Austria, a double process began in the ranks of the working class: Disappointment with the policy of reformism showed itself in the ranks of the workers, and many of them turned their backs on the social democratic parties. In addition there developed a strong urge on the part of the workers towards

the establishment of the united working-class front. In some cases this was seen in a demand for organisational unity, and in others in the going over of the most class-conscious sections of the reformist workers to the Communist Party.

Naturally, the social democratic and trade union leaders are carrying out various manoeuvres in order to hold up this process, but are they in as favourable a position for that purpose now as they were in the years 1918 to 1920? They are certainly not; they no longer have such possibilities. This is above all the case because the changes which have taken place in the working class and in the working-class movement have occurred under the conditions of severe economic crisis and of an intensifying crisis of capitalism.

How did the social democratic and reformist trade union leaders succeed in manoeuvring in the period mentioned?

In Germany, where the Social Democratic Party was in power in that period the social democratic leaders let loose the reactionary soldiery on the workers. In 1920 the Noske guards turned machine-guns on the peaceful demonstration of workers, which took place in 1920 in front of the Reichstag to protest against the passing of the Factory Councils Law, but at the same time the Social Democratic Party was able to hold up the development of the revolutionary movement by offering reforms which were of consequence to all workers: Tariff agreements, the eight-hour day, full civil rights, factory councils, with the right to say a word in the development of conditions within the factories, etc. After the war the workers in a number of countries were no longer completely without rights as they had been prior to the war, when the trade unions were still compelled to fight for their recognition on the part of the employers, etc.

Are the reformist leaders at present in a position to offer the broad masses of the workers anything at all? No, they are not. In recent years the bourgeoisie in all capitalist countries has been striving to pass the burdens of the economic crisis on to the shoulders of the workers, and in this it has had the support of the social democracy. With social democratic assistance the bourgeoisie has abolished or greatly worsened the laws which were passed immediately after the war. With the assistance of the social democracy the bourgeoisie has considerably worsened the economic situation of the working class. In many capitalist countries increasing masses of workers are recognising that the policy of the reformists for the achievement of socialism by peaceable means leads direct to fascism. For this reason the social democratic leaders are no longer in a position to deceive the working class as they did in the years 1918 and 1920. This situation makes it possible for the Communist Parties and for the revolutionary trade union movement to utilise the growing discontent of the masses with the policy of reformism and to utilise the growing urge to working-class unity.

This new factor in the situation makes it necessary to overhaul our tactics and to make certain changes, and to overhaul also the methods, form and content of the work of the Communist Parties.

How must the united front tactic be applied? This formulation of the question might convey the impression that the Communists now intend to abandon the tactic of the united front from below. That is naturally not the case. **The united front from below must remain the basic form of the Communist united front tactics.** However, this does not mean that the application of the united front from above is thereby excluded from our activities. It may possibly be seen that in some cases the application of the united front from below is the only possible tactic, but it can never be the case that the application of the united front from above is the only possible tactic.

Let us take the case of France, where an agreement has been

* (Taken from a speech delivered to Communist members of the Red International of Labour Unions.)

reached between the leaders of the Socialist Party and Communist Party for joint action in a number of questions. It was not so long ago, at the beginning of this year, that the congress of the Socialist Party (although against the will of a strong minority) and the leadership of the Socialist Party were opposed to any negotiations in the question of a united front with the Communists. However, after this refusal the lower organisations of the Communist Party again approached the lower organisations of the Socialist Party with proposals for a joint struggle against fascism, and the result was that the united front began to show itself in practice in Paris and in other industrial centres.

The pressure that was set up from below in this way proved to be so strong that the socialist leaders **Faure** and **Blum** were compelled to admit that against the will of the leadership of the Socialist Party the idea of the united front was gaining ground, and that the only way to prevent their own members establishing a united front of their own accord and without their leaders was for their leaders to take up negotiations with the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Is it possible under such circumstances to declare that the establishment of the united front in France was the result of an agreement from above? Certainly not.

There can be still less talk about the establishment of a united front only from above on account of the fact that in a number of countries (France and Great Britain, and still more Austria) a great section of the members of the reformist trade unions and of the Social Democratic Parties are not only beginning to insist on the establishment of a working-class united front, but are beginning to establish it themselves against the express decisions of their leaders.

The new element in the present application of the united front tactic is not therefore that the Communists have taken up a fundamentally different attitude to this or that form of the united front tactic, but that the Communists are now applying this tactic more daringly and with greater elasticity by opening up a decisive attack on the social democratic leaders and trade union bureaucrats who are sabotaging the struggle for the establishment of the united front.

Up to the present the united front has been established on the initiative of the Communists whereby two tactics have been applied.

In some cases a united front was established in various questions between the leaderships of the parallel political parties or trade unions whereby the Communists and the revolutionary trade unions at the same time addressed themselves to the members of these organisations and called upon them for a joint struggle.

In other cases where the central leaderships of the Socialist Parties and the trade unions rejected the united front proposals the Communists and the revolutionary trade unions organisations addressed themselves directly to the lower organisations of the socialist and trade union bodies, thereby ignoring the decisions of the socialist and reformist trade union leaders.

It is a well-known fact that on February 9 and 12 great masses of the French workers demonstrated on the streets at the call of the Communist Party, and that many members of the Socialist Party and of the reformist trade unions took part in these demonstrations in defiance of the express instructions of their leaders not to take part in the demonstrations; in other words, a section of the workers amongst the following of the socialist and reformist trade union leaders and against the will of the latter were drawn into the struggle against fascism by the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions.

In a number of countries the reformist leaders are continuing their old tactic of openly sabotaging the united front. In these countries working-class solidarity is being established by the adoption of the Communist united front proposals by the lower reformist and socialist organisations (Great Britain and Czechoslovakia).

What advantages does the united front in the struggle against capitalism and fascism offer to the workers? Above all it increases the strength of the workers in their struggle against the bourgeoisie. Secondly, it strengthens the fighting capacity of the workers and their confidence in their own strength. Thirdly, it increases the authority of the Communist Party in the eyes of the masses, because it destroys the legend zealously encouraged by the socialist and reformist trade union leaders that the Communists are anxious to disrupt the working-class movement. Fourthly, it guides the social democratic workers back to the

class struggle. And, finally, it increases the influence of the Communist Party on the social democratic workers by bringing about a rapprochement between the Communist and social democratic workers.

The Communist Parties are only at the beginning of their work for the establishment of the united front. Up to the present comparatively little in this direction has been done, but that little which has been done has proved itself to be an important step forward to a rapprochement between the Communists and the broad masses of the workers.

Question: What is the programme of the united trade union movement? What is its programme where it is already a matter of practical politics, i.e., in France and Spain?

Answer: The situation with regard to trade union unity in Spain is that there are central bodies of the revolutionary trade unions, of the reformist trade unions, and of the anarcho-syndicalist trade unions, and in addition there are a host of autonomous trade unions. However, the prospects for a unification of all these unions are thoroughly favourable. The members of all the existing unions took part in the recent strikes, even in cases where the reformist and anarcho-syndicalist unions did not appeal to their members to come out on strike.

The programme on which the revolutionary unions in Spain propose the establishment of trade union unity takes into account the revolutionary situation existing in the country, and comprises the following demands: The abolition of all anti-proletarian legislation, a struggle against reaction, for the right to strike, for the forty-hour week without wage-cuts, for increases in wages, for State insurance without contributions on the part of the workers, etc. And organisational guarantees such as proportional elections, the right of criticism and inner-trade-union-democracy.

It must be pointed out that the struggle of the revolutionary trade unions in Spain has been hampered by the fact that the work in the committees for trade union unity was neglected, and that in consequence these committees have almost ceased to exist. Only recently has any real attempt been made to make good this mistake.

The situation is somewhat different in France. In France practical life has created a new form of trade union unity. The reformist trade union bureaucrats are sabotaging trade union unity with every possible means at their disposal. Only recently the leaders of the reformist trade union federation (C.G.T.) answered the unity proposals of the revolutionary trade union federation (C.G.T.U.) with the demand that the unions affiliated to the latter should dissolve themselves and that their members should join the C.G.T. unions unconditionally. They go further even and declare that they are prepared to discuss the calling of a national trade union congress only after such an unconditional dissolution of the revolutionary unions. In other words, the reformists say to themselves, after the revolutionary workers have joined our unions we shall have a chance of seeing the relation of forces; if the revolutionary workers are in a minority then we shall call the national congress and let it demonstrate our preponderance. If, on the other hand, the revolutionary workers should prove to be in the majority in any of the big unions then we shall postpone the calling of the congress until we have "reorganised" the unions in question.

The way in which the reformist trade union bureaucrats treat the question of unity shows clearly that if the revolutionary unions were to accept their conditions then the reformist bureaucrats would strain every effort to exclude the former revolutionary leadership under various pretexts from any part in the leadership of the united trade union federation. The French reformist trade union bureaucrats have already had a wide experience in this sort of thing. Prior to the split in the French trade union movement they expelled whole organisations which opposed their policy of class collaboration.

Can the revolutionary trade unions possibly accept such a proposal? They certainly cannot and they will not. Instead they are working for trade union unity on the basis of a programme of minimal demands, whereby they also demand guarantees that they will be able to work inside the proposed united trade union federation.

Must the idea of trade union unity be abandoned in France because the reformist trade union bureaucrats reject it? Certainly not, say the revolutionary trade unions, particularly in view of the fact that broad masses of the French workers, including many

members of the reformist and autonomous trade unions, are already beginning to join the working-class united front.

By September 1 no less than 166 united trade unions had already been formed in France, 105 amongst the railwaymen, 27 amongst the tobacco workers, 12 amongst the transport workers of the Paris district, and 3 amongst the miners, etc. The movement is also beginning to affect the trade unions in other branches of industry.

This weapon of establishing unity must inevitably begin to exercise pressure on the reformist leaders, no matter how much they may try to win the workers for their own plan of trade union unity, i.e., unconditional surrender on the part of the revolutionary unions. Are the revolutionary trade unions evading this new weapon for the establishment of unity? Not at all. On the contrary, they are doing their best to bring the various unions together in this way in at least some definite branch of industry. These new united organisations which arise by the bodies concerned leaving the reformist C.G.T. and the revolutionary C.G.T.U. respectively, although in some cases the bodies in question continue to remain members of their old federations, may play a very important role in the struggle for the establishment of trade union unity.

Years had to be sacrificed to prove the necessity of work within the reformist trade unions. This necessity is now no longer denied in words, but in deeds little has changed since the Sixth Congress of the C.I. in this work and no fundamental improvement has taken place.

Why have the decisions of the C.I. and of the R.I.L.U. concerning the work in the reformist unions not been carried out?

The chief reason is that the Communist Parties have not always been successful in applying these decisions to the circumstances which exist in their particular countries. For instance, the Communist Parties in those countries where revolutionary trade unions exist have failed to distribute their forces in such a way that both the work in the revolutionary and the reformist unions has received proper attention. In other countries poor or wrong leadership has caused the revolutionary trade union opposition to exert the major portion of its efforts outside instead of inside the reformist unions. In a third group of countries where the Communist Parties have succeeded in forming illegal revolutionary trade unions which have led a number of strikes, but have failed, owing to the intense terror, to develop into mass organisations, the Communist Parties have carried on no work at all in the official unions. For instance, in China the work in the Kuomintang unions was completely neglected, as also was the work in the fascist unions in Italy.

Very often the decisions were carried out purely mechanically, and the slogans and agitation of the Communists were not always readily understood by the members of the reformist trade unions; the approach of the Communists to the masses was very often of a sectarian character.

In addition to the above-mentioned reasons it must also be pointed out that the decisions adopted with regard to a number of individual countries did not always take into consideration the concrete conditions existing in the countries in question or the difficulties with which any attempt to carry out the decisions must meet.

The failures and weaknesses of our trade union work caused some comrades to conclude quite wrongly that as the Communist Parties had not attained sufficient success in their trade union work the trade union policy of the C.I. was therefore incorrect. These comrades are wrong. The work of the Communists in the reformist trade unions in Great Britain, Sweden, Poland and the United States has proved that where the Communist policy in the reformist unions is carried out with understanding and persistence undeniable successes can be obtained.

What sort of a new trade union policy do those comrades who are dissatisfied with the old propose? The policy they are said to propose is that the revolutionary trade unions should capitulate unconditionally, dissolve themselves and instruct their members to enter the reformist unions. It appears hardly likely that we should be able to obtain any improvement in our trade union work along such lines.

Must we reject always and under all circumstances the policy of the revolutionary trade unions unconditionally joining the reformist unions? In individual cases such a policy is possible—where the members of the red union which unconditionally joins the reformist union are given the chance of fighting inside the

reformist union for the official posts and freedom to carry on their struggle in the interests of the workers.

Is it possible to take these individual and isolated cases and make out of them a policy to be followed by the whole of the Communist Movement? In my opinion that is not possible.

Why? First of all, because we have in general no reason to believe that the reformists will be prepared to give us such freedom of movement in their organisations if we enter them unconditionally. And, secondly, in a revolutionary crisis the Communist Party cannot do without mass trade unions under its influence, organisations which embrace greater masses of workers than the Party itself and organisations through which the Party can exercise an influence on the masses of the unorganised workers also.

Is it advisable under these circumstances to let smaller revolutionary trade unions in France or Spain join their reformist opposites unconditionally? The revolutionary trade unions in these countries deny this. In France and Spain there are a number of smaller unions parallel to the big revolutionary trade unions, very often in the same town, and the unconditional transfer of these smaller unions might lead to a practical dissolution of the revolutionary unions and to a capitulation to the reformist demands.

At a moment like the present, when great events are maturing, is it possible for the Communist Parties to stand alone without the support of broad and sound mass organisations influencing great masses of the workers? In my opinion that would be impossible. This is true above all of those Communist Parties which are faced with big and decisive struggles.

I am reminded of an example taken from the history of the proletariat in Tzarist Russia prior to the October Revolution. On August 12, 1917, the Provisional Government and the representatives of all the bourgeois parties and the compromising parties had left Petrograd, where the revolutionary struggle had broken out. They journeyed to Moscow in order to hold a Council of State there. They fled from revolutionary Petrograd to "conservative" Moscow. The Moscow Committee of the Bolsheviki decided to organise a 24-hour general strike as a welcome to them. In Moscow and in many other centres throughout Russia there already existed a broad mass organisation: the soviets of workers and soldiers deputies. However, the Moscow Soviet decided against the proposed general strike, owing to the fact that the Mensheviki and the Social Revolutionaries had the majority in it. The Moscow Committee of the Bolsheviki then appealed to the trade unions, and the latter signed an appeal jointly with the Bolsheviki for a 24-hour general strike. Thus the Bolsheviki organised a general strike over the heads of the leaders of an existing mass organisation, the soviets, and with the assistance of the trade unions and the factory committees.

Such situations did not arise as the result of any particular national peculiarity of Russia, and they can arise in other countries also.

In general, therefore, the Communists do not think it desirable to dissolve the mass organisations which are already under their ideological and organisational influence, and they will not recommend these organisations to join the reformist unions unconditionally and without having secured guarantees that the Communists and their supporters will have freedom of movement in the reformist unions. However, this does not diminish but rather enhances the importance of a determined and conscious struggle for trade union unity upon certain conditions whereby the Communists must carry on a persistent, patient and convincing campaign to show the reformist workers that the Communists are putting forward these conditions in the interests of the struggle of the whole of the working class.

Question: At the present moment in France the slogan for the independence of the trade unions from all political parties is in circulation. This slogan has been taken up by the Communist press as one of the conditions for the unification of the trade unions and without any critical comment. Lenin has continually condemned the slogan of the independence of the trade unions as a theory aiming at throttling the class struggle. Are not our French comrades distorting the fundamental principles of the united front and unity tactic right at the beginning of their mass movement for unity?

Answer: In my opinion the comrades who formulate the question in this fashion are wrong. There is no such thing as a neutral trade union. We know that. The trade unions cannot

be neutral towards the bourgeoisie if they are going to carry on a struggle against it. In consequence the trade unions cannot be neutral towards that party which carries on the class struggle against the bourgeoisie. That is the Communist Party. That is clear. However, in this case it is not a question of the neutrality of the trade unions, but of their independence of the political parties. Let us take a look at the question from the standpoint of the concrete situation in France.

In France there are two big working-class parties, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party, and two big trade union federations which own allegiance to the respective political parties. The Communist Party of France has taken on the task of unifying these two big trade union federations.

However, the Communists cannot agree to any unification of the trade unions so long as the unions follow the lead of the Socialist Party, and, on the other hand, the Socialist Party cannot agree to their unification so long as the unions follow the lead of the Communist Party.

One must not turn a correct thesis into a dogma, and to ignore the concrete situation which exists in France and in which the struggle for trade union unity is proceeding would be to make a correct thesis into a dogma.

The question of the leadership of the trade union movement is not a matter of a simple declaration, but a matter of the correct policy and tactics with which the Communists must win the masses for the leadership of the Communist Party. The unification of the trade union movement would offer the Communist Party the possibility of extending its influence to much larger masses of workers than has been the case up to the present. For this reason our French comrades are right when they have refused to make the question of trade union independence a hindrance to the unification of the trade union movement.

What does the independence of the trade unions mean? Perhaps that the Communists will not organise their fractions in the unions, and that they will cease pursuing their Communist policy in them? Nothing of the sort. The socialists will also not cease their work in the unions. In an article on trade union unity the "Populaire," of August 25, 1934, writes:—

"We are prepared to leave the deceitful slogan of 'no politics' to the reactionaries. In reality all trade union work is based upon some definite political standpoint."

The French Communists who are anxious to make some real advance towards trade union unity, have agreed to the slogan of independence without in the least having abandoned their fight to influence the activity of the trade unions through their fractions in the unions. For this reason the French Communists do not put forward as one of the conditions of the unification of the trade union movement that the leadership of the Communist Party should be recognised formally in advance, but rather they are doing their utmost to convince the majority of the workers in the unions that Communist leadership is the only correct one.

Question: To what extent does the estimation made by the Communist International that the social democracy is the main social prop of the bourgeoisie alter, and to what extent must this alteration be reflected in the trade union tactic of the Communist Party of Germany?

Answer: In my opinion we must above all remember what was in Germany prior to the fascist dictatorship and what is there now. It is generally admitted that prior to the seizure of power by Hitler in Germany the Social Democratic Party and the reformist trade unions supported the bourgeoisie in every possible way, and that they supported one bourgeois government after the other. The trade unions were a hindrance, both to the political and the economic struggle of the working class. Let us take as an example the November strike of the Berlin passenger transport workers a few months before Hitler's accession to power. After the seizure of power by fascism the reformists handed over the trade unions to the fascists. On May 17, 1933, the whole social democratic parliamentary fraction voted unanimously for Hitler's foreign policy.

At the moment there are neither reformist trade unions nor any other sort of trade unions. There are also no mass reformist organisations of any other nature. There is also no centrally organised Social Democratic Party. Those groups of social democrats which show any signs of life at all are undoubtedly against the fascists.

It is naturally not impossible that the bourgeoisie may turn

back the wheel. It would appear even that the German bourgeoisie has made some approach to the reformist trade union bureaucrats by taking up negotiations through a mediary, as reported in the "Manchester Guardian." It is not impossible that there will once again be reformist trade unions, or mixed reformist-fascist trade unions, built up with the assistance of the reformist trade union leaders. If such organisations developed into mass organisations then the reformists might once again, and to a certain extent, play the role of a social support of the bourgeoisie.

However, can one say that the small groups of social democratic workers who are carrying on agitation against fascism, issuing leaflets and sometimes spreading Communist literature, and joining here and there in a united front with the Communists, not to speak of cases where they have joined the Communist Party, whereby they expose themselves to the risk of persecution and arrest, are a social support of the bourgeoisie? Certainly not.

In Germany the Communists have now set themselves the task of reconstructing the old free trade unions in the best traditions of the pre-war period in order that they may, above all, organise the struggle against the law of January 20, 1934, which robs the German workers of all the rights won in fifty years of working-class struggle. At the same time, the German Communists are working within the fascist mass organisations.

Fight Against Imperialist War

The Revelations at the American Armaments Enquiry

By P. F.

Illustrious Agents of the Armaments Industry

"What a position! We find that the government of the United States is encouraging the private sale of arms to foreign States, and that the King of Great Britain is doing the same! Is not this in paradoxical contrast to the efforts towards disarmament?"

This pious protest escaped from the lips of Senator **Vandenberg** during the deliberations of the Washington Committee of Investigation, when the evidence that the armaments industrialists, who defiantly emphasised their intimate relations with the State and in particular with its military apparatus, as well as the responsibility of the governments and statesmen brought to light some things that were really too outrageous.

Louis L. Driggs, president of the "Driggs Ordnance and Engineering Company," the biggest undertaking in America for the production of anti-aircraft guns could carry on his foreign business on the strength of a magnificent publicity testimonial supplied to him, at the time of Coolidge's presidency, by the war department through the Under-Secretary of State **Robins**. The war ministry is working in a barefaced way as a **partner in the armaments industry**. Soon after this Driggs' armaments combine was in a position to make use of this "expert opinion" of the war ministry in a big deal with the Turkish government. As if that were not enough, the U.S.A. cruiser "Raleigh" made a trip to Istanbul in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Driggs anti-aircraft guns. The U.S. Navy as agent for the Driggs armaments combine (as it is also for the Electric Boat and other firms)! —Senator Nye could not help saying that "the cruiser Raleigh has been used as a sales-ship for private armaments firms."

The U.S.A. war ministry went still further in the case of Colombia. Here the commander of the fleet, **James P. Strong**, worked out, in the interests of two armament combines (Driggs and "American Armament Corporation"), a plan for the "defence of Colombia in the event of a war with Peru." (It may be remembered that the U.S.A. armament combines, in intimate touch with the war ministry, are also equipping Peru.)

It was a matter at first of a 2,000,000 dollar deal. No wonder that Commander Strong was handed over to the government as a military and naval expert (read chief armaments agent). The deal was brought off. Incidentally Mr. Strong became the owner of armaments shares. Yankee imperialism is often fond of lending officers of high rank in this way. For Bolivia—here it concerned an order amounting to 1,800,000 dollars—Cuba and San

Domingo, the "American Armament Corporation" brought off something of the same kind.

But the main sensation—because in very fact it is a glaring illustration of the real state of affairs—was the revelation of events that took place when the firm of Driggs (U.S.A.) and that of Vickers-Armstrong (Great Britain) were competing for the Polish armaments market. For years Driggs had been frankly endeavouring to supply Poland with their anti-aircraft guns. And then none other than his majesty the King of England flashed on to the scene. On January, 1932, the Warsaw representative of the Driggs Company sent his chief in New York the following telegram:—

"King of England has sent for the Polish ambassador in London and intervened in favour of a contract of sale concerning new English 75cm. anti-aircraft gun model. 'Chief'" (this is a Polish general who decides on the sale and no doubt is pledged to the Driggs Company) "is resisting terrible pressure. Positions hard to defend. Make haste and summon official Polish commission to America. Waiting impatiently for promised telegram."

As Senator Pope read out this edifying document it became so quiet that one could hear the flies buzzing in the hall.

President Driggs, who, by the way, confirmed the facts, cried pathetically: "Such things oughtn't to be made public!"

In the interests of U.S.A. imperialism Senator Bone could not help pointing out that King George of Great Britain was not without a substantial interest in Vickers-Armstrong.

Moreover, Driggs complained of the "immoral" competitive methods employed by the British firm of Vickers-Armstrong.

"Their methods are dirty. The firm of Vickers-Armstrong has even employed well-known demimonde in Ankara in order to exert appropriate influence on members of the Turkish government."

Not only King George, but also his successor to the throne is active.

The Prince of Wales, who up till now has a flattering reputation as a traveller in the latest fashions, seems nevertheless to be animated by a loftier moral gravity than one thought, for, as emerged at one of the Washington sessions, he acts as an illustrious commercial traveller for the products of the British armament industry. All the same it will be a relief to honest republicans to learn that the less pretentious lustre of a President, residing in the White House (Hoover is meant), knew how to compete victoriously with the glory of the British heir-apparent.

The well-known Curtis-Wright Combine for the production of aeroplanes controls the American market and in part also that outside America. At the beginning of 1931 the Prince of Wales made a journey through South America, which enabled his royal highness to work as an agent for the biggest industrial and commercial interests in Great Britain. Of course the armaments industry played a leading part. The Senate Commission had before it, among others, a detailed letter from Curtis-Wright's general representative in South America, Webster, to the managing director Wright, in which these facts are set down in all detail, with a request that immediate steps shall be taken with the almighty military and air chief in Chile, the State Secretary Merino. Since Merino had been invited by the Prince of Wales to visit him, an immediate and urgent invitation of the same kind on the part of the U.S.A. war department and of President Hoover himself should be sent. And so it happened. And with success. Curtis-Wright's business in Chile (value 2,700,000 dollars), which at the time was touch and go, was O.K.

During the examination of the methods of the Curtis-Wright Combine—the Senate Committee dealt with the various undertakings systematically—there were a number of interesting disclosures. Thus, Curtis-Wright supplied military and bombing planes simultaneously to Bolivia and Paraguay, who were at war about the Grand Chaco; the president of the firm, Allars, negotiated with Bolivia, whilst its South American representative, Webster, simultaneously dealt with Paraguay. It was this same Webster who expressed in a letter dated February 8, 1932, and in later letters his conviction that the Grand Chaco war, which was nursed by the Argentine or by Standard Oil, would set the whole of Latin America on fire, and for that reason one must play one's cards opportunely.

To the Curtis-Wright aeroplane combine, too, prominent military pilots were "lent" by the score; these, either in Poland

(where it was a matter of ousting French competition), or in Colombia, or in Turkey, etc., made publicity flights in the interests of foreign business.

In this connection it was established that no less a person than MacArthur, chief of the general staff of the United States army, travelled as "head salesman for the American armaments lords," as the president of the investigating committee, Senator Nye, described it.

Such facts occur over and over again. Basil Zaharoff, in one of his cynical letters, states that one must simply "belabour" the governments and industries until one has reached one's goal. For example Zaharoff and his American pal Carse went on "belabouring" the governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, and their ambassadors in Spain, until the Spanish submarine boat market had been wrested from the German armament industries and was assured to the lords of the world market, Vickers and Electric Boat. (Bonus for Zaharoff personally: more than 1,000,000 dollars.)

VARIOUS NOTABLE FACTS

The Tear-Gas and Poison-Gas King Governs Cuba

John W. Young, president of "Federal Laboratories Inc. of Pittsburg," is the tear-gas and poison-gas king in the U.S.A. He deals, too, in other weapons and munitions—for example, with certain automatic rifles, favourites amongst the gangsters. Mr. Young has been complaining bitterly that German firms have been underselling him in gangster weapons.

Before the Senate Committee this gas manufacturer has been telling tales out of school.

When he recommended his goods as a means of fighting strikers and demonstrators Senator Nye asked:—

"Has business in tear-gas gone up since the textile strike began?" (The committee was sitting during those lively weeks.)

"Sure," answered Mr. Young, "between 5 and 10 per cent.!"

In the overthrow of the Grau San Martin government in Cuba and in the establishment of the Mendieta government, at present at the helm, it was Tear-gas-Young, so he frankly admitted, who played the decisive part. He provided Mendieta and his people with gas, bombs, grenades and money. His capital was appropriately invested. It is a profitable business to become secret regent of Cuba. Mr. Young and his people steer Cuba's policy; they are reorganising the armed forces and police of the Cuban President Mendieta, who is their tool. Young does first-rate business, especially in tear-gas. And the queer thing is, he boasts of his "humanity."

"Under Machado," he told the Investigating Committee, "thousands of people were shot down. Under the present regime my tear-gas claims considerably fewer victims."

Here one of the Senators was heard to whisper something about "interference by a citizen of the U.S.A. in the affairs of a friendly nation."

Bones of violent contention—concerning tear and poison-gas, as well as arms, bombs and munitions of all kinds—are Honduras, Costa Rica, San Salvador, Colombia and Brazil. Here there is in particular a field of activity for French armament firms. In San Salvador the Germans have their chief agent in General-Field-Marshal von Mackensen's son. Naturally Mr. Young has equipped both the warring States, Bolivia and Paraguay, with poison-gas. U.S.A. firms are smuggling gas into the Argentine, where the use of gas is forbidden.

The Missionary With Bible and Bomb

Mr. J. W. Young, president of the biggest poison-gas works in the U.S.A., spoke up before the Senate Committee in favour of "Latin America for the (U.S.A.) Americans!" That is why this thorough-going Yankee sent his own brother, Paul Young, to Central America, where, as a missionary in the name of the "Christian Missionary Alliance," he had a remarkable role to play.

"The activities of this modern St. Paul," remarked Senator Bosse at one of the concluding sessions of the committee, "whom I picture to myself as having a gas mask in one hand and a gas bomb in the other, gives an entirely new meaning to the old psalm: 'Forward, soldier of Christ!'"

A striking symbol for the role played by the churches and the religious communities of various kinds in the preparation for and carrying on of imperialist war!

Two Presidents of Mexico are also in it.

As has already been shown, the Curtis-Wright aeroplane com-

pany is particularly active, and knows how to bribe over and over again the right people, as, for instance, in the case of the highest army chiefs in the Argentine and Bolivia.

Thus this company has vigorously fanned the flames of war (Grand Chaco and Leticia) between **Bolivia** and **Paraguay**, as well as between **Peru** and **Colombia**, and has done good business in bombs with all sections (there was also business in bombing planes).

At the moment, as is shown by reports, it is making the most of the armaments boom in **Asia Minor** and the **Far East**.

The Presidents **Calles** and **Rodriguez** of **Mexico** have also got a hand in the **Curtis-Wright** business—to say nothing of the half-dozen Mexican generals, who have had plenty of graft. President **Rodriguez** of **Mexico** has, as is shown by a document, made a bad speculation with his own aeroplane works and lost a lot of money in them. When the **Curtis-Wright** Company indemnified him appropriately, it got them—especially **Rodriguez**, who is aviation dictator—to form a “new company,” in which the former president **Calles** was willing to become director and chief shareholder. This can be read in a document of recent date (November 29, 1933).

Good Business with Chiang Kai Chek and the Chinese Generals

Most of the American (and also European) armaments combines have an admirable market in **Kuomintang** China. This has been shown by the glimpse of light that has been thrown on the **Far East** by the **Washington Committee**.

It is primarily bombing planes that are supplied; and with them **Chiang Kai Chek** and other white generals attack the **Red** districts.

U.S.A. firms also see to the equipment of the **Nanking** government and its armed forces with poison-gas.

In this and other cases various generals are bought over for suitable sums.

Mention has already been made of the fact that the wheat-loan given to **China** in 1933 in view of the famine was used, at the request of **American** and **European armaments industrialists**, for the purchase of arms and munitions.

U.S.A. Senators and Government Officials as Tools of the Armament Concerns

The **Senate Committee** could have occupied a number of its sittings (it was prudent enough not to do so) with an investigation of proceedings inside the **Senate** and the **White House**. It was proved, for instance, in one of the first sessions, on the strength of some interesting correspondence, that the election of **Senators** and their appointment to important committees were “cooked” by armament firms, as was stated in a detailed letter from **Joyner**, vice-president of **Electric Boat**, to the president **Carse**. To the “**House Rules Committee**” of the **Senate**, which is decisive in matters of legislation, two very well-known **Senators** were elected as tools of the armaments industry. They forced through some legislation that was very agreeable to the armaments lords, among other things the “**deficiency bill**,” which brought in millions of dollars for **Electric Boat**. In addition, the **Roosevelt** naval programme, which in the course of time is bringing as much as two milliard dollars to the armaments industry.

Members of parliament in the different States of the **U.S.A.** are also under the orders of the armament magnates. **Poison-gas-Young**, whose works are in **Pennsylvania**, got “his” **Senators** to wreck a bill that was to prohibit the production and exploitation of tear-gas. (The three **Senators** concerned were named in one of the concluding sessions.)

In the same way influential men in the **U.S.A.** war and naval departments, as well as the police, were named; letters showed that these were completely in the hands of the armament industry.

These facts, just as much as the vigorous protests made by the governments of a large number of countries, helped to turn the scales in favour of an adjournment of the **Senate Committee**.

But the factor that has really determined the discontinuance of public investigation by the **Senate** is the tremendous indignation at the warmongers and war profiteers who are drawing all nations into their net of death and destruction. This world-wide echo was not what **U.S.A.** imperialism wanted. That is why the **Washington Committee** has ceased work until further notice. Now the toiling masses in all capitalist countries must insist upon these highly placed criminals being publicly unmasked and publicly flogged.

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

Letters from the Soviet Union

(III.) SOVIET STEAMER “RASKOLNIKOV”

By A. Komját

Stalingrad, July 10.

We steam down the **Volga** on board the passenger and freight steamer “**Raskolnikov**”: from **Kasan** to **Stalingrad**. The shores of the mighty river roll past in “eternal beauty.” From minute to minute the picture changes, rocks, ravines, slopes, a glory of varying shapes and colours; gray and bright, wild and peaceful, contrasts and transitions without end.

Where are the traces of the civil war which once devastated this region? Where are the signs of socialist construction? Are those not the “**Burlaki**,” **Nekrassov's** down-trodden heroes, whose bent forms may be seen on yonder shore? And is that ship not a **Tzarist** steamer: on the upper deck the rich landlords, prosperous merchants, overfed bourgeois—down below fetid holes, where human being are huddled together in filth and misery?

Suddenly—the voice of a sailor: “That is the place where the **White hordes**, whom we put to flight, drove fifty **Volga** ships together and burned them in impotent rage.”

Suddenly—a new cement factory. Great excavators tear up the face of the earth.

Suddenly—a pioneer camp: Sickle and hammer over the doorway, children romping, their red scarves flying.

Suddenly—harvest brigades, movement showing the steady energy of the shock troops; threshing machines, motor lorries, loaded trucks.

Suddenly—villages and towns, new peasants' and workers' houses, school buildings, works and factories,

The ghosts of the dead past vanish. Soviet reality of to-day shows its countenance,

* * * * *

The Soviet steamer “**Raskolnikov**” is a part of the socialist earth.

Here again we see at every step that the proletariat rules in this country! The upper deck, the cabins, the dining saloon, formerly the privilege of the rich, are now occupied by the toiling masses, rank and file workers, collective peasants, Party and Soviet functionaries, **Red Army** soldiers, **Red** sportsmen.

“Have the classes been done away with?” asks a foreign passenger.

No, they have not yet been done away with, just as they have not yet been done away with on the railways. Here, as there, a too hasty equalisation would only be detrimental to the whole. In order to abolish the classes, we must first build a great many more ships and railway carriages, and raise the cultural level of the broad masses tremendously. But what a difference between former days and now! The lowest class cabins are spacious and clean—the passengers here are for the most part peasants, carrying all kinds of luggage with them. The passengers have a canteen where they can buy cheap food. Nursing mothers with their children have a cabin of their own.

“And what kind of lives do the crew lead?”

An old seaman, who has served on this ship for twenty-five years, tells us:—

“Before the revolution our working hours were unlimited. We were crowded together in narrow cabins, and never had a proper sleep. Often the food was absolutely uneatable. We had to do military drill. Now we work only eight hours, have good food, and never more than two sleep in one cabin. Of course, we maintain discipline, but it is voluntary, not forced like it used to be. We kept our old captain for a long time, for he was a good seaman. But he would not recognise that the old days were really over, and was always trying to drive us; he could not stand our holding meetings. So we packed him off. Our present captain is a **Bolshevik** who fought against **Koltschak**. He understands his work, too, and we get on well with him.”

Here there is no “upper” and “lower” class, no barriers. Seamen, engineers, mechanics, wireless operators, all mix with the passengers in their free hours, debating, joking, playing with them, with a naturalness only possible among class brothers.

The Soviet steamer "Raskolnikov" is one infinitesimally small part of the gigantic front of socialist construction.

Here, too, socialist organisation reigns; here, too, socialist competitions are carried out, pace of work and labour productivity increased, the quality of the work improved, the Plans fulfilled and over-fulled. Here, too, the Communists, the Young Communists, the shock brigades, set the example.

I ask a Communist sailor what subjects they are dealing with now in his cell. He replies:—

"For months we have been working through the material of the last Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, especially Stalin's great speech. We have gone through this speech paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, and have resolved in detail on the practical conclusions to be drawn by us for our work on this ship. We have studied and carried out the new directives of the Party.

"Now we are working through Manuilski's report on the international situation. Perhaps you will wonder that we have just reached this now, whilst the international situation has altered considerably since February. But there are always some of us on duty on the ship, and it is difficult to assemble all the comrades at the same time. In order not to fall behind, we hold small group meetings outside of the cell meetings; here we read the newspapers and discuss the latest events of the international situation. We issue a hectographed newspaper of our own daily."

This comrade bombards me with questions as to the meaning of the blood bath of June 30, Hitler's coup against Roehm. We are speedily surrounded by other seamen and passengers. In a moment the whole upper deck is full of eager debaters.

The Soviet steamer "Raskolnikov" is a piece of socialist culture.

In the seamen's "Red Corner" I find the works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and a quantity of belles lettres, both Russian and foreign writers. Some classics are among them: Pushkin, Gogol, Tolstoy, Dostoyevski.

A Moscow professor gives a strictly scientific lecture on psycho-technical questions. Will these "abstract" problems interest the passengers? The audience: workers, peasants, Red Army soldiers, listen with close attention, and put questions which frequently reveal surprising expert knowledge. Most of these questions aim at the use to be made of psycho-technics in practical life, for increasing the productivity of labour, etc.

A number of Red Sportsmen improvise a "social." Everybody is present, without thought of difference of rank. An opera singer of the old school throws himself into a heroic pose and sings difficult operatic arias, followed by folk songs. Tumultuous applause. Workers perform parody sketches. They parody the opera singer (who is not at all offended); they sing, dance, perform gymnastics. The whole saloon is filled with joyous mirth.

This is only a small drop of culture? But it is a drop of the mighty river of socialist culture flowing across the whole country.

We steam down the Volga in the Soviet steamer "Raskolnikov."

The Week in the Soviet Union

Before the Soviet Elections

A joint Plenary Session of the Moscow Soviet and of the Moscow Executive Committee was held on October 23 in connection with the approaching Soviet elections. Leading functionaries of the Moscow district, of the City of Moscow and Comrade Jenukidze, the secretary of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union, delivered reports.

Comrade Kaganovitch, greeted with stormy applause, delivered a comprehensive report. The Plenum summed up the results of the work of the Moscow Soviet since the last election.

The figures given showing the growth of Moscow are particu-

larly noteworthy. In the last four years the population of the Red capital has increased by 847,000. Moscow now has 3,628,000 inhabitants. In the last four years 2,000 new houses were built, 400 of which are house blocks several stories high. 450,000 persons have obtained flats in new buildings. At the same time 25 new tram lines have been opened. The network of electric street lighting has been extended threefold. The number of persons taking their meals in the public dining rooms has increased threefold. The school system of Moscow has been greatly extended.

The government of the R.S.F.S.R. has adopted the following rules for the election of Soviet delegates: In localities numbering up to 300 electors there will be one Soviet delegate to every 15 to 20 electors. In towns with 400,000 to 450,000 inhabitants there will be one delegate to every 400 to 500 electors. In Moscow and Leningrad one delegate will represent 1,500 inhabitants. In the district Soviets of Moscow and Leningrad one delegate will represent 500 electors.

Before the Conclusion of the Grain Deliveries

On October 20 the Annual State Grain Delivery Plan was fulfilled almost 98 per cent. Over 100 million more poods of grain were delivered than were delivered at the same date last year. Eighteen districts and Republics have fulfilled their annual plan before the scheduled time.

After the distribution of the new harvests the collective peasants will place their surplus on the market.

The data regarding this year's income indicate the increasing prosperity of the collective peasants. It is reported from the Kabardino-Balkarian district that an average of 1½ poods of grain is paid out per work day. In addition, the peasants receive potatoes, vegetables, fruit, meat, butter, wool, honey and other products.

The North Caucasian region fulfilled the annual plan of grain delivery two months earlier than last year, and delivered 5 million poods more than last year. In addition, up to October 20, the collective farms of Northern Caucasus sold 2 million poods of grain on the market. In the same district the autumn sowing plan was already fulfilled by October 20.

The 15th Anniversary of the Liberation of Voronezh

Great festivals were held in Voronezh on October 15 on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the liberation of Voronezh from the white bands. Participants in the fights for Voronezh related their experiences of these days. The slogan of the festival was: Strengthening of the defensive forces of the country and fulfilment of the industrial and financial plan before the scheduled time.

The speakers at the celebrations emphasised the important role played by Comrade Kaganovitch in the liberation of the town from the Whites. The town park on Voronezh was therefore named "Kaganovitch Park."

It was decided to set up commemoration tablets at the spots where the fights took place. The Voronezh Pedagogic school is granting scholarships for the children of Red Army soldiers who fell in the fights for Voronezh.

A celebration meeting of the town Soviet of Voronezh was held on October 24, to which Comrades Kaganovitch, Voroshilov, Budjonny and a number of former commanders and organisers of the Red Guard who took part in the defence of the town, were invited.

Valuable Building Material for the Soviet Palace

The Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union has organised an expedition which has the task of discovering specially beautiful building material for the Soviet Palace. The expedition has found very valuable building material, including coloured tufa, large quantities of yellow quartz, porphyry, blue-green tufa of extraordinary beauty, and various kinds of volcanic rock, of which a large number of specimens has been sent to Moscow.

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