

COMMUNIST WORK IN **BRITAIN**  
THE WEYMOUTH T.U.C. - -

Harry Pollitt  
A. Losovsky

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



October 5th, 1934

VOLUME XI

**COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL** No 19

THREEPENCE  
CONTENTS  
OVERLEAF

---

---

# CONTENTS

Number 19

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

- |  | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. The U.S.S.R. and the League of Nations.                                     | 727  |
| 2. The Work of the C.P.G.B. since the 6th World Congress.<br>By Harry Pollitt. | 733  |
| 3. The British Trades Union Congress at Weymouth. By A.<br>Losovsky.           | 742  |
| 4. Company Unions in the U.S.A. By B. Sherman.                                 | 747  |
| 5. From Experience of Illegal Party Work in Germany. By A.<br>Muller.          | 750  |

## REVIEWS.

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 6. A Book on Soviet China. Reviewed by L. M.                                    | 754 |
| 7. "A Sly, Cowardly, Spineless and Characterless Rat." Review.<br>by L. Madyar. | 755 |
- 
-

## THE U.S.S.R. AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

THE entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations has become a fact. In reply to the invitation of thirty-four countries, led by France, Great Britain and Italy, the Soviet Government signified its consent, after which it was formally accepted as a new member of the League of Nations, and was given a permanent seat on the Council of the League. September 18, 1934, was a date of great international importance and a great victory for the Peace Policy of the U.S.S.R.

This event made a very strong impression on the masses of workers, unemployed, peasants and the wide range of office employees and intellectuals. Millions of these, during the last few months have been experiencing the pending clouds of war almost physically, of which they will be the first victims. This event also produced a very strong impression in the camp of the imperialists, the reformists and social-fascists.

But, though this event is almost universally appraised as a new and outstanding victory for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, there are extremely *divergent interpretations* among the imperialists, reformists and social-fascists on the one hand, and the Communists on the other as to *the motives* which induced a number of leading imperialist powers to invite the U.S.S.R. to join the League of Nations and those inducing the U.S.S.R. to accept. *Estimates of the results* which may follow from this acceptance are exceptionally *diverse*. There are the strongest disagreements on this question. In the camp of the imperialists themselves they are torn by internal contradictions.

We find the parties of the Second International trying to interpret this step of the U.S.S.R. as the acceptance of the social-democratic policy on the League of Nations by the Bolsheviks (see the social-democratic press of Czecho-Slovakia, France and Germany, which will be dealt with below).

We find a similar self-deception in the bourgeois press (see *Temps* of September 17), to the effect that there has been a profound change "in the foreign and even in the internal policy of the Soviet Union," a supposition which merely indicates how fervently the bourgeoisie hope to see a "new," i.e., a bourgeois, Russia. Comrade Litvinov emphasised in his speech of September 18 that the U.S.S.R. entered the League of Nations as a new social economic system, completely retaining her self-reliance and independence of her politics. She is not giving up any peculiarities of her government, and the U.S.S.R. does not bear the responsibility for former actions of the League, and will fight against those deci-

sions and actions of the League directed towards the oppression of nations. Generally,

*"a new member joining an organisation, can only be held morally responsible for those decisions adopted with his participation and agreement."*

This statement was a blow to those elements living on these hopes.

We find the British Conservative organ, the *Times*, expressing its sorrow that the acceptance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations was not accompanied by certain guarantees against Bolshevik propaganda. The German and Japanese capitalist press gnashes its teeth, which is the best proof that, if this step of the U.S.S.R. was intended to block the path of the warmongers in Berlin and Tokyo, the shot had reached its mark.

Here could be heard the shrieks and the groans of the Vatican, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and all the obscurantists who regard it as almost equivalent to sacrilege and the defilement of sanctuaries to admit Communists into the holy of holies where hitherto only the stainless angels of capitalist ownership have been found, and who foretold general destruction in the flames of the world revolution which the Bolsheviks will doubtless organise from the platform of the League of Nations.

All this discordance arises from the complex web of inter-relations, from the variety of interests and strivings of various parts of the capitalist world which is groaning in the grips of contradictions and being torn to pieces.

The false interpretation of the policy of the U.S.S.R. and the discordance in the camp of the imperialists in their estimate of the event of September 18th must serve the revolutionary proletariat as a warning voice against drawing hasty conclusions, unnecessary exaggeration or harmful illusions. One of the most harmful of these is the illusion that the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations will remove the war danger.

The Soviet Union understands very well that she entered an organisation created by the Capitalist States. She understands the extent of the limitations of the means and possibilities at the disposal of the League of Nations and that the limit of international co-operation and its duration, like the grouping of powers in the camp of the imperialists, is determined by the contradictions inherent in the capitalist world.

It must not be forgotten that not only among the bourgeoisie in those countries which voted against the acceptance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations, but also those which voted for, there are passionate opponents of rapproche-

ment† with the U.S.S.R. These carried on a frantic struggle before September 18th for the organisation of war against the U.S.S.R. and will continue to do so in the future.

We must not forget that Poland, which signed the non-aggression pact with the U.S.S.R., thereupon signed an agreement with Germany, which is openly preparing to attack the Soviet Union. This same Poland, following in the steps of the three great powers, expressed herself in favour of the invitation to the U.S.S.R. to join the League of Nations, but stubbornly opposes the signing of the Eastern Pact. We must not forget the double game being played by England with the two states which are now trying to start this war—one attitude to Germany and another to Japan. (Apropos of this, two days after the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations the *London Times* issued a violent anti-Soviet attack.) We must not forget all kinds of unexpected changes in the plans of individual governments, whose conduct depends on the most varied changes in the internal and external situation of their countries, for the development of which stable time and confidence in the next day has long since passed.

It would, however, also be harmful to underestimate this big event. It would be harmful to harbour an over-simplified idea that in reality "nothing has changed." This would be simultaneously an under-estimation of the possibility of a sharper and more practical struggle for peace by the U.S.S.R. and the international proletariat, thanks to the new position won by the Soviet Union.

For the tens of millions of toilers whose lives are staked in a new world war, even the slightest step in the direction of averting this war is a tremendous achievement. For the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, the further guarding of the great socialist structure is a primary task and also at the same time a necessary condition for the successful revolutionary struggle against capitalism in their native country. In the same way, for the revolutionary vanguard, even a simple postponement of the approaching war, which opens the possibility of a further struggle to abolish or forestall it by a proletarian revolution, is a big success for the entire world revolutionary front.

#### Why Did Soviet Union Join League?

If the international proletariat are to be able to utilise the new position won by the U.S.S.R. for the cause of peace and attaining their class aims, they must have a clear understanding of two questions.

Firstly, what new conditions, what changes in international conditions, compel the overwhelm-

ing majority of the capitalist countries, led by the "great" powers—France, etc.—to seek rapprochement with the Soviet Union at the present moment, despite their ineradicable hatred for the Soviet system.

Secondly, what causes gave rise to the consent of the U.S.S.R. to enter the League of Nations, which had been regarded by the Soviet Union as a clearly imperialist organisation in essence and whose efforts to organise capitalist "order" had been considered utterly fruitless.

It is easy to reply to the first question if we take the danger of war (which has greatly increased the contradiction among the imperialists in connection with the intensification of the crisis) into account, and if we remember the enormously increased power of the Soviet Union, which is a very strong factor for peace. Japan's attack on China and its seizure of Manchuria have created a danger to the American spheres. This, together with the increasing power of the country of the Soviets, which is even more menaced by Japan, was the cause of the changed policy of the U.S.A. towards the U.S.S.R., leading to the restoration of diplomatic relations between them.

Finally, the advent of Hitler to power in Germany increased the annexationist tendencies of German imperialism. Germany has begun to arm feverishly in spite of the Versailles Treaty. She is making great efforts to annex Austria and the Baltic countries by methods of violent actions, she is trying to turn Soviet Ukraine into a *hinterland* by an anti-Soviet war, she is therefore a direct menace to the hegemony\* of France on the continent of Europe and the looming prospect of a war of revenge against her, compelled France to change her policy towards the U.S.S.R. This led to the invitation to the U.S.S.R. to enter the League of Nations.

Hitler's advent to power in Germany was likewise bound to cause serious changes in the policy of Great Britain and Italy. Britain supported Germany to the extent that this was needed to weaken the hegemony of France in Europe in favour of Great Britain and helped to bring Germany into the anti-Soviet front directed by Great Britain. But when German fascism carried on a frantic annexationist policy, it resurrected the danger which had driven Britain into an anti-German alliance with France on the eve of 1914. This danger is all the greater because with new military technical development (the increased rôle of aviation) the island of Great Britain, without an alliance with France, is exposed to attack. This caused Great Britain to change its front. And despite the strong contradictions between Italy

\* Hegemony — from Greek "hegemon" — leader. Leadership or predominance.

† Reconciliation.

and France in the Mediterranean and the Balkans, Italy was compelled to consent to draw closer to France when German fascism, by its policy of the Anschluss† with Austria, became a strong menace to Italy. A number of the small and medium states in Europe have good grounds to fear that in a new war catastrophe they would lose the last vestiges of their independence or even cease entirely to exist.

French imperialism above all, and later British and Italian imperialisms, were compelled to take the path of rapprochement to the U.S.S.R., not only in view of the strengthening of the German danger, but due to the fact that the greatly increased power of the Soviet Union had made it into an extremely strong citadel against war.

For many years, French imperialism as one of the chief organisers of the anti-Soviet bloc, considered that the Soviet Union was no longer the same country that, fifteen years previously, had seemed an easy prey to the interventionists. Fifteen years ago the imperialists could not cope with the Soviet Union, and now it has become an incomparably stronger force. It has turned from an agrarian country, backward in economic, technical and cultural respects and devastated by war, a poverty-stricken country, into an industrial country, a country of the most advanced technique, a country of the largest scale agriculture in the world, a country in which an enormous upsurge has taken place among the masses of the people, a country which has increased its defensive powers to a tremendous degree. Even the class hatred of the French and the entire world bourgeoisie for the social and economic system in the Soviet Union (which represents a tremendous danger for the entire capitalist system), could not conceal the obvious fact that that Soviet Union was growing from day to day absolutely in every direction. This hatred could not conceal another undoubted fact, that the Soviet Union, despite all the shouts of "red imperialism," was directed to the postponement of war, and conducted a struggle not only against anti-Soviet war, but against all imperialist wars in general.

#### Success of Peace Policy of Soviets.

Hence, also, a number of big successes for the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. ensued during the last year. A prominent place among these is occupied by the recognition of the U.S.S.R. by the U.S.A., the conclusion of a series of non-aggression pacts, and the adoption of the definition of the aggressor as proposed by Soviet diplomacy by many other states.

And no matter how the nimble political acrobats of the Second International try to explain the

entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations as a forced compromise and a concession in principle under the pressure of bourgeois countries, the revolutionary proletariat of the entire world well understand the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations, primarily as a result of its enormous power, the pressure of which has made itself more and more clearly felt on the course of world development.

If the turn in the policy of the imperialist governments from open aggression to the Soviet Union to a policy of rapprochement — granted that it is temporary and unstable but nevertheless a definite rapprochement—can be one of the circumstances hindering an immediate anti-Soviet campaign, if this is a great achievement (and there is no doubt that it is), then this achievement is also the result of the uninterrupted revolutionary struggle of the masses of the proletarians and semi-proletarians against war and capitalism.

All these conditions together compelled the worst enemies of the proletarian dictatorship to draw nearer the Soviet Union and seek its entrance into the League of Nations.

Passing on to the question of why the U.S.S.R. agreed to join the League of Nations, we must point out first of all that the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League is a natural continuation of its consistent and successful policy of peace. The policy of the capitalist world, particularly in the form of the League of Nations, has suffered a defeat in respect to the Soviet Union. During the first fifteen years of the existence of the Soviet Union, this policy was either to attempt to crush it on the pretext that it aimed at "red imperialism" or, at the best, to draw it into the struggle of one group of imperialists against another. One after another the legends of the war plans of the Soviet Union broke down. The legend of its military alliance, first with Germany, then with Italy, collapsed. At the same time, by its systematic exposure of the war plans of the imperialists, the Soviet Union has repeatedly succeeded in disrupting plans which were already prepared for carrying out.

#### Why Japan and Germany Left the League.

In the world conditions which have arisen, when Japan, having created Manchuria as its outpost of war against the Soviet Union, is day by day provoking the outbreak of war, when German-Japanese rapprochement for war has become a fact, it is not very difficult to guess what caused the Soviet Union to accept the invitation to join the League of Nations.

The Soviet Government, the proletariat of the country of Soviets and the revolutionary workers of all countries, do not harbour exaggerated illu-

† The absorption of Austria by Germany.

sions in respect to the League of Nations. They merely recognise, on the one hand, the significance of the changes in the attitude towards the Soviet Union which have occurred as the result of the tremendous weakening of the capitalist world and the growing power of the Soviet Union. They realise that the attitude of the League of Nations towards war depends, at the given moment, on who composes it. For those imperialist cliques which, like Japan and Germany, have already placed war on the order of the day, the League of Nations, headed by those who are not aiming for war at the present moment, is a hindrance, even though small and formal, on the path towards the immediate commencement of war. In this are expressed the growing contradictions in the camp of the imperialists inside the League of Nations that led Japan and Germany to leave the League of Nations, to set their hands free for war.

The entrance of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations will undoubtedly considerably increase the restraining rôle which the League of Nations has begun to play in the most recent period. On entering the League of Nations, the U.S.S.R. does not change its attitude in principle towards the Versailles system to the least degree. It is still against it. At the same time it is against the use of the methods of war to revise the frontiers, established by the Versailles Treaty. It is against a new counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R. and an imperialist war for a new partition of the world under the flag of the revision of the Versailles Treaty. On entering the League of Nations, it will be possible for the U.S.S.R. to fight still more effectively and practically against a counter-revolutionary war on the U.S.S.R. and against imperialist war for a new repartition of the world.

Firstly, the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations will increase the isolation of the chief instigators of war, Germany and Japan, and will strengthen the anti-war position of those who are against war at the present moment, but are hesitating.

Secondly, on entering the League of Nations, it becomes possible for the U.S.S.R. to organise resistance to the warmongers by many-sided agreements.

This policy of disrupting the war plans of the most aggressive imperialist states by correctly taking account of all the changes in international relations is the most real policy of peace based on the interests of socialist construction, on the vital interests of the proletariat of all countries and the proletarian revolution.

What has this proletarian policy in common with that interpretation of it, given by the social-

democratic press in connection with the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations?

Neither the uncouth provincial boorishness of the Czech socialists' newspaper, *Social-Democrat*, nor the honeyed tones of the speech of Leon Blum on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Jaurés (see *Populaire* of September 17) were able to lead proletarian public opinion astray regarding the aims of the leaders of social-democracy when they depicted the new act in the peace policy of the Soviet Union as the abandonment of the former Bolshevik estimate of the League of Nations and a transition to the position of social-democracy on this question.

Leon Blum regards the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations as a "double triumph" for the Socialist Party of France. On the one hand, he claims, this is a triumph for the French Socialists over the French reactionaries, over the supporters of Barthou, who, a few months ago, was hurling thunderbolts at any attempt at rapprochement with the Soviet Union, and now ("such is the revenge of history," exclaims Blum), this same Barthou is compelled to make a fervent speech at Geneva in favour of the acceptance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations. The second triumph—a triumph of the Socialists over the Communists—is alleged to be the fact that the Communists have accepted the policy of Leon Blum's party, the policy of supporting the League of Nations, and recognising its rôle as a fighter for peace.

#### Has Soviet Policy Changed?

In all this reasoning there is not a word of truth. First of all, the French Socialists have the least right to attribute the credit of turning the French imperialists in the direction of rapprochement with the Soviet Union to themselves. In the past they have helped the capitalists to carry out their anti-Soviet policy. Since the first days of the October Revolution they have helped French imperialism to fling dirt at the Soviet Union by supporting the legend of a "red imperialism." They have helped the anti-Soviet war by voting for war credits, participating in the preparation of anti-Soviet plans, defending the wreckers in the "Industrial Party"\* and the Mensheviks,† who were carrying out the orders of the French General Staff, and systematically undermining the united front of the French proletariat against their bourgeoisie. If there is a "revenge of history" in respect to Barthou and his confrères, there is an equally striking "revenge of history" in respect to Leon Blum and all those leaders of French socialism who, not wishing to risk the loss of the remnants of their popularity amongst the masses,

\* See *Wreckers on Trial*. Modern Books, Ltd.

† *The Menshevik Trial*. Modern Books, Ltd.

admit of the war danger (it is admitted now even by the supporters of Barthou) which they have previously denied, and together with Barthou approve of the entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations. As for the triumph of the Socialists over the Communists, on this question neither the enthusiasm of the proletariat of France for the united front, nor the agreement between the Communists and Socialists to cease mutual attacks during the period of the joint struggle, will prevent the exposure of the whole falsity of this statement and the disruption of the attempts of the French Socialist leaders to make political capital out of the events which have occurred. Leon Blum and his friends will not be able to convince the French workers that the Communists are now conducting the policy of social-democracy in respect to the League of Nations. They will not be able to justify their old policy nor obtain an amnesty from the workers for their party by such tricks. Every thinking worker understands the difference between the present efforts of the Soviet Union to utilise the changed situation inside the *already existing* League of Nations, when it has become a certain obstacle to the unleashing of war by fascist Germany and militarist Japan, and the participation of the socialists in the *formation* of the League of Nations at a time when it was very plain that one of the chief aims of its formation was to organise a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. It was the French Socialists, even more than their brethren in other countries, who relapsed into the most vulgar and false bourgeois pacifism long before the formation of the League of Nations, bowing down to Wilson, whose idea it was to form the League of Nations and even classing him with Jaurès. It was the French Socialists, above all, who did everything in their power to raise the authority of the League of Nations and sent one of their leaders, Albert Thomas, to the post of leader of the Labour Office of the League of Nations, which united all the measures of the bourgeoisie for bridling the working class and bringing about capitalist rationalisation. The French Socialists supported the League of Nations in respect to war and anti-Soviet intervention at the time when the imperialist leaders of the League were much stronger than the country of the Soviets, which was defending itself against intervention with the help of a ragged, bootless and starving Red Army. This has very little resemblance to the entrance of the powerful Soviet Union at the present day into the League of Nations, making the statement through its representative—Comrade Litvinov—that it takes no responsibility for the past activity of the League and that it is entering the League not for the sake

of war but for the sake of *active participation in the work of the League with the aim of preserving peace*, in the struggle for which, under present circumstances, the participation of the Soviet Union may have decisive importance.

The German Social-Democrats, who capitulated to fascism, are also wasting their efforts when they try to make an analogy between the present entrance of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations and Germany's entrance in 1926. The Social-Democratic paper, *Deutsche Freiheit* (see issue of September 12th) evidently forgot the circumstances in which Germany entered the League of Nations, when the aim and maybe the condition of its admission into the League was its change from the policy of Rapallo\* to a "western" orientation, when German Social-Democracy, the auxiliary of French imperialism, stubbornly advocated and conducted the policy of "fulfilment" on the one hand and with equal insistence drove Germany from the path of Rapallo to the path of the "western orientation," i.e., the anti-Soviet path, on the other. Evidently, even the lessons which it has received during the last two years since Hitler came to power have not taught it to see the tremendous difference between the entrance of the Soviet Union into the League and the former entrance of Germany. The representatives of the Soviet Union, where the proletariat is in power and complete masters of the country, can bring pressure to bear on the League, relying not only on the workers of the Soviet Union, but on the forces of the whole of the world proletariat for support. But when German social-democracy was saving German and French capitalism and grovelling before them, clutching at the steps of their chariot, it sacrificed the vital interests of the German proletariat to them.

The French, German and Czech socialists are simply lying when they try to prove that the Bolsheviks, as represented by the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties of all countries, now regard the League of Nations as a strong citadel of peace, a firm guarantee against war. This is not true. We Communists view the participation of the Soviet Union in the League of Nations merely as a modest possibility of hindering the approach of war and we regard it a crime on the international proletariat to ignore this possibility, however humble it may be. It is not the thirty-four states which invited the Soviet Union, and not even the powers which were the initiators of this invitation, and still less the states which voted against the admission of the Soviet Union, which could give any guarantee for the preservation of peace. Both beyond the confines of the League

---

\* The Soviet-German Treaty.

of Nations and inside it, imperialist contradictions will continue to grow. The relative importance of the representatives of the Soviet Union inside the League of Nations, and consequently its possibility of exerting an effect on the course of events will depend on the forces which stand behind the representatives of the U.S.S.R.—growing socialist construction and the growing revolutionary united anti-fascist and anti-war front in the capitalist countries.

The entrance of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations is taking place at the moment of ever-increasing revolutionary activity of the masses. In all capitalist countries, the proletarian masses are overcoming all difficulties with the greatest enthusiasm, organising the united front and conducting a heroic struggle under the slogans of the Communists against the capitalist offensive, against the lowering of their standard of living, against fascism and war.

The growth of the relative importance of the U.S.S.R. in the world arena, the growth of its authority, not only among the workers, but also among the widest strata of the petty-bourgeoisie and intellectuals, is a very strong reinforcement for the anti-fascist and anti-war front.

Seventeen years ago the October Revolution took power away from the bourgeoisie and handed it over to the proletariat.

At the present stage of the struggle, when the victory of fascism in Germany, Austria and Bulgaria has encouraged and activated fascism in almost all countries, the struggle to eliminate the split of the proletarian ranks and the disjointedness of proletarian activity has become a question

of life and death for the working class as never before.

If we search among all the slogans, for that one having the greatest power to unite the workers, the unemployed, the wide strata of the office workers and intellectuals, it is hardly likely that any slogan will be found stronger than the slogan of the DEFENCE OF THE U.S.S.R.—THE GREATEST STRONGHOLD AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR.

This is why the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses throughout the world will welcome the new success of the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

In struggling under the leadership of the Communists for the victory of the united anti-war and anti-fascist front, the revolutionary workers of all capitalist countries, with the full realisation of their responsibility, will treble their vigilance, will keenly watch their own "native" imperialists, will promptly expose and upset their imperialist, anti-Soviet, counter-revolutionary plans. While increasing their resistance to fascism and strengthening day by day the united front against the class enemy in their native country, they will best of all strengthen their fighting alliance with the proletariat of the U.S.S.R.

The revolutionary workers, led by the Communists, will march forward under the banner of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of Soviet Power in the complete realisation that IT IS NOT A NEW IMPERIALIST WAR, BUT THE VICTORIOUS PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION WHICH WILL RELIEVE THE WORLD OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM, OF CRISIS, WAR AND FASCISM, AND THAT ONLY THE SOVIETS WILL LEAD TO THE TRIUMPH OF COMMUNISM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

## **SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS COMMUNIST** **INTERNATIONAL**

**With the next issue (No. 20) the "Communist International" will commence the publication of important Discussion articles for the Seventh World Congress of the C. I.**

**ORDER YOUR COPY NOW**

## THE WORK OF THE C.P.G.B. SINCE THE 6<sup>TH</sup> WORLD CONGRESS

THE period in Britain since the 6th World Congress of the Communist International held in the autumn of 1928 has been one of the most important in the history of British politics. Many fundamental and far-reaching changes have taken place in the policy of the British ruling class in this period; changes brought about by the economic and political developments, strikingly foretold in the analysis of the international situation made by the 6th Congress.

As was common to other capitalist countries in 1928, the capitalists and reformist leaders in Britain were confident that a new era of ever-expanding capitalist prosperity was at hand. The improvement in the trade position of Britain, largely brought about by the betrayal of the General Strike in 1926 by the reformist leaders, the subsequent defeat of the miners, had been followed by heavy attacks on the workers' standards, intensive application of rationalisation, and on this basis there had been a certain revival of production. But it was a revival brought about by a lowering of the workers' standards, and the most intense forms of exploitation in the factories.

These facts, of course, were not considered relevant to the "new perspectives for organised capitalism" being dangled before the eyes of the British workers.

Labour leaders paid visits to America and came back drugged with Fordism. "Ford was superseding Marx," we were told by the theorists of the Labour movement.

The I.L.P. was busy with its glowing promises of "Socialism through capitalist prosperity," to quote the words of its theoretician, Brailsford, at that time. "Socialism through the adoption of the Living Wage Policy" was the slogan of the I.L.P.

The Labour Party was busy preparing for future General Elections and compiling its programme, "Labour and the Nation," which was to give every section of the community a square deal, and injure the interests of none.

The capitalists were busy proclaiming the need for more permanent and closer collaboration with labour. There was to be compensation for those displaced by rationalisation, the workers were to have more recognition in the factories, and a real place in the Sun of Capitalist Industry.

This was Britain in the autumn of 1928. No thought or belief in any coming economic crisis, ever onwards to more and better forms of organised capitalism. Like their counterparts on the Continent, the British Labour leaders were tireless

in their talk of "the new situation" and "the need for a new and more statesmanlike approach to the problems that modern capitalism has brought forward."

Recalling these facts, it is important to again note the perspective given by the 6th Congress in the autumn of 1928, and we shall see at once the correctness of the Communist International's analysis, how totally wrong the reformists were, and the bitter price the workers under their influence have paid.

The thesis of the 6th Congress stated:

"Therefore, the development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation inevitably leads, in the final analysis to the present 'Stabilisation' period growing into a period of gigantic cataclysms."

It is worth while drawing the attention of the reformist workers time and time again to the above quotation, because they know only too well how deadly true the "period of gigantic cataclysms" has turned out to be. Germany, Austria, Spain are very pertinent to point out just now. In America, the classic land of Fordism and The New Deal, we have had and are still witnessing some of the greatest conflicts between labour and capital that have ever been known. It will greatly enhance the authority of future Congresses of the Communist International if we recall these quotations.

In regard to fascism, the 6th Congress theses stated the following:

"Fascist tendencies and the rudiments of the fascism movement exist in a more or less developed form in nearly all countries. The ideology of class co-operation — the official ideology of social democracy — has many points of contact with fascism. The employment of fascist methods in the struggle against the revolutionary movement is observed in a rudimentary form in the practice of numerous social democratic parties, as well as in that of the reformist trade union bureaucracy." (*Theses on International Situation, 6th Congress, C.I.*)\*

At the same time as the 6th Congress of the Communist International was making its analysis, the British Trades Union Congress was meeting. The main issue before this Congress was that popularly known as Mondism. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress submitted a report, which was accepted by the Congress, in which were analysed what should be the future methods of policy for the Trade Union movement of Britain. It was stated there were three courses open for adoption. Firstly, the path of revolutionary struggle, which was "decisively rejected as futile, certain to fail, and sure to lead to bloodshed and misery." (Shades of Germany and Austria.)

Secondly, for the Unions to stand aside from

\* Obtainable from Workers' Bookshop, Ltd.

present developments and tell the "employers to get on with their own job," while the Unions would pursue the policy of fighting sectionally for improvements. This course was also described as "futile."

Finally, there was a third course, and this was the course adopted at the Swansea Trades Union Congress in 1928:

"The third course is for the Trade Union Movement to say boldly that not only is it concerned with the prosperity of industry, but that it is going to have a voice as to the way industry is carried on, so that it can influence the new developments that are taking place. The ultimate policy of the movement can find more use for an efficient industry than for a derelict one, and the unions can use their power to promote and guide the scientific reorganisation of industry as well as to obtain material advantages from that reorganisation." (*Report of General Council to Swansea Trades Union Congress, 1928.*)

#### "Organised" Capitalism.

Therefore we can see how in 1928 the whole policy of the Trades Union Congress, Labour Party and I.L.P. was based upon an entirely false perspective, i.e., there are no further crises of capitalism, but there is organised capitalism leading to socialism, on the basis of class collaboration. But at the same time as this was taking place a fierce drive was also commencing against the revolutionary workers both in the Trade Unions and the Labour Party to try to remove all obstacles that aimed to prevent this policy being operated.

In May, 1929, came a General Election, and the return of a second Labour Government. Reformist illusions at this time were very strong, and strong beliefs existed amongst the masses that now a real new era was going to open. The first shock was not long in coming. In July, 1929, there was a big cotton strike in Lancashire, and through the medium of Labour Government intervention and arbitration heavy wage cuts were inflicted upon the cotton workers.

This gave the clue to all that followed during the existence of the second Labour Government. What happened to the Lancashire cotton workers happened in the same way to the Yorkshire woollen workers and South Wales miners. The Anomalies Act of the Labour Government was the father and mother of the Means Test. Its repression of the colonial peoples has not been improved upon, even by the present National Government.

When the economic crisis in the winter of 1929-30 drove Britain into its vortex, the Labour Government excelled itself in its efforts to assist the capitalists to solve the crisis at the expense of the workers, i.e., the May Economy Commission, Special Cabinet Economy Commissions. At this time there was also a rising militancy amongst the workers, big strikes were taking place, there was a rapid growth in the disillusionment of the

workers with the Labour Government, revealed in the loss of votes at every by-election which took place.

With the deepening of the crisis, unemployment figures steadily rising, the competition for the dwindling market becoming fiercer and fiercer, the ruling class, in spite of the Labour Government's willingness to carry through their demands for further attacks on the employed and unemployed workers, decided in view of the whole situation that extraordinary measures were necessary to save British capitalism, and in August, 1931, they kicked the Labour Government out of power.

A National Government was formed, headed by three principal Labour leaders, Mac-Donald, Snowden and Thomas. Immediately the fiercest attacks were begun on the whole working class, and at the same time plans were laid for an intensive attack upon Britain's trade rivals.

Britain went off the gold standard. The Englishman's proud boast, "As safe as the Bank of England," was not sounding so proud as formerly. The century-old policy of Free Trade was abandoned for one of protection. Currency was devaluated, and an elaborate system of Trade Pacts, Quotas and Tariffs worked out. The famous Ottawa Agreement was put through, and the most open attacks, hostility and war preparations made against the Soviet Union, so that it soon became possible to describe the National Government as replacing France as the organiser of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

But the attacks on the workers were meeting fierce resistance. The attempt to cut the wages of the Navy led to a mutiny in the Atlantic Fleet at Invergordon, an event which astounded the world. The attacks on the unemployed led to great class battles in Belfast, Birkenhead, Liverpool and Bristol, and great mass demonstrations were the order of the day throughout Britain.

#### 1931 General Election.

A General Election took place in November, 1931, and the ruling class utilised every conceivable weapon of propaganda and lies to stampede the country to return a National Government. As was only natural, it was the Labour leader, Snowden, who was chosen to play the leading rôle in attempting to deceive the workers. His famous wireless broadcast on the eve of the election, that unless a National Government was elected the workers' Post Office Savings would be in danger, will long be remembered in "Democratic Britain."

The treachery and betrayal of the Labour Government and the disillusionment it had caused amongst the workers greatly facilitated the return of a National Government.

The offensive against the workers went on

unabated—wage cuts, Means Test, Unemployment Benefit Cuts, carried through by Orders in Council, and Parliament told about it afterwards, but still the figures of unemployment continued to rise. Chamberlain held out no hope for ten years. MacDonal spoke about big sections of the unemployed being superfluous scrap.

The workers continued to fight heroically against the capitalist attacks. The big demonstrations, hunger marches, the big Lancashire cotton strike in the summer of 1932, all show this.

Alongside all this, great ferment was expressing itself inside the ranks of the trade unions and the Labour Party. The reformist leaders were bitterly criticised and forced to all sorts of subterfuges to explain away the record of the Labour Government. It found strongest expression inside the I.L.P., which culminated in July, 1932, by leaving the Labour Party. The minority in the I.L.P. formed the Socialist League in England and the Socialist Party in Scotland, both organisations remaining affiliated to the Labour Party.

The Labour Party leaders were replying to the discontent inside their Party with promises, "it would be different next time; let us all work now for a third Labour Government." New programmes were worked out, differing in no essentials from the Liberal-Labour platform of 1929. The Trade Union leaders were pursuing to the fullest limits the policy of Mondism. No attempt to organise united resistance or common action. No working out a common lead or strategy, the standing argument of political and trade union leaders was "you cannot fight during an economic crisis; wait till the next General Election."

The National Government went ahead with its policy of lowering the workers' standards at home and in the colonial countries, every conceivable measure was resorted to in an endeavour to gain trade advantages, at the same time in line with other capitalists it steadily increased its war preparations.

In the last quarter of 1933 a slight improvement could be noted in the trade position of Britain. This improvement continued until June, 1934, but has not been maintained since then. The speeches of National Government Ministers, like Runciman, now begin to reveal some anxiety about the future. In his speech in Parliament on July 27th he stated:—

"There were signs that the home market was nearing saturation point. He had already drawn attention to the fact that it could not be expanded farther without unduly endangering our export trade . . . They must rely on an improvement in world trade for an improvement in the employment figures. World trade unfortunately was still paralysed in many regions, and the best that could be said was that there were indications that the tendency of international trade to decline was being restricted, although there were as yet no signs of any marked im-

provement. I do not believe there can be any very great improvement in the trade of the world until we reach somewhat calmer times."

A few days later the Federation of British Industries issued its Quarterly Analysis of the Economic Situation, and amongst other things had the following to say:—

"It is, however becoming increasingly clear that so far from British trade being, as many still believe, at the beginning of a recovery, it is probably already back to normal, having regard to the limitations of the international situation, that situation shows few signs of improvement, and in some directions has deteriorated. Apart from the many outbreaks of social and political unrest, and the exacerbation of trade and exchange restrictions, the condition of certain of the countries still on an operative gold standard is giving cause for anxiety."

In August there was held a special meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain, at which a discussion took place on the situation in Britain and the next tasks of the Party. The resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee showed how life itself overthrew the hopes and aims of the capitalists to return to "stabilisation." It showed how barefaced was their attempt to conceal the real situation behind the boast of "recovery." The resolution further showed that the necessity for the revolutionary socialist solution of the crisis stands out ever more sharply, and it summed up the policy of the National Government as follows:—

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

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

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

In internal policy, the increasing drive towards preparatory measures of a Fascist type against the workers is seen in the Unemployment Act and Police Act already carried, in the Seditious Bill, in the new legislation under preparation for the police control of meetings, in the numerous prosecutions of militants, as well as in the direct assistance and protection given in practice to the open Fascist movement of Mosley.

At the same time, the National Government presses forward its economic policy of tightening of the grip of monopolist capital under direct State leadership in all branches of economy by promoting the formation of State-aided cartels and price-fixing combines, by subsidies to industry, and by quota systems and artificial price-raising in agriculture for the benefit of the landlords and big farmers.

All these policies are directed to increase the domination and profits of the ruling bourgeoisie at the expense of the workers and petty-bourgeoisie. These economic policies are at the same time closely linked with the advance to Fascism, and the strategic preparation for war.

This sketch of the main developments that have taken place since the 6th Congress, can now form the basis of considering the work of the Communist Party during this period, and will perhaps help in the important discussions that are taking place in all sections of the Communist International.

#### Work of the C.P.G.B.

Before the 9th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. there had been important discussions in the C.P.G.B. on the line of Class Against Class, and the need for openly fighting the Labour Party in elections, and for independent leadership of the economic struggles. There was a division on this issue in the Central Committee of 1928 and at the 9th Plenum the British question occupied an important place in the discussions.\*

The issue was fought out and agreement reached on fighting for the new line. But it soon became clear that in some cases it was only agreement on paper, and not in deeds, for in the intervening period before the 6th Congress there were many hesitations and mistakes in carrying out the line.

The 6th Congress affirming the slogan, "class against class," discussed the tasks of the C.P.G.B. and the resolution that was adopted instructed

"the Party to initiate a wide discussion on the tactical change in the Party policy and on the methods of carrying out the new tactics." (Sixth Congress Theses on Tasks of C.P.G.B.)

With this guide the Party endeavoured to popularise the 6th Congress decisions and discussion, and to concretely apply them to the situation in this country.

Wide discussion took place in the Party, and good sales were secured for the various pamphlets containing the Congress decisions.

A big campaign was organised against Mondism; conferences, meetings were held all over the country, great support was won for our policy, but the gravest mistake was made in this situation by the Party actually slackening off work in the Trade Unions, a mistake which we paid dearly for in subsequent years. The new line was quite wrongly interpreted to mean there was no longer anything to be gained by working in the reformist unions, and more stress was placed upon the rôle of the unorganised workers.

The new line was also not concretely applied in every phase of Party activity, especially in our concrete exposure of reformism. The result was that in the General Election of 1929 there was a

minority of comrades on the Central Committee, who, whilst in favour of putting forward Communist candidates where possible, in other places were for supporting the Labour Party.

This attitude not only affected the electoral policy of the Party, but had its political repercussions in every phase of Party activity, considerably retarding the full force and authority of the Party being mobilised to carry out the decisions of the 6th Congress.

Nevertheless, the Party was very active amongst the unemployed and took an active part in strikes, especially the cotton strike of 1929, but the outstanding weakness of this work was that we only took part in the strikes after they had broken out and were looked upon in many instances as "outsiders." This situation was undoubtedly due to our bad methods of work in the factories, and the criminal neglect of work in the trade unions.

The Party gave full support during this period to the struggle of the revolutionary miners of Scotland, who were fighting against the splitting policy of the reformist miners' leaders. The split which was forced brought about the formation of the United Mineworkers of Scotland Trade Union, which in spite of terrific obstacles to-day is playing a leading part in the life and activity of the Scottish miners.

By taking the work of the Party as a whole in this period, we can say that in spite of certain achievements, in the MAIN THE PARTY WAS DEEPLY SECTARIAN in its methods (mainly not in the sense of "left" doctrinarism, but in the sense of being closed in and in its ideological-political narrowness) and isolated from the mass movement, and not able to organise the growing mass discontent that was developing in the trade unions and Labour Party against the Labour Government and against the results of the Mondist policy of the Trades Union Congress.

In November, 1929, the 11th Congress of the Party was held, to which the E.C.C.I. sent a special Open Letter, which naturally became the background to the whole Congress discussion. The Open Letter played a decisive part in the history of our Party, and all of us may profit by reading and studying it again.

#### Open Letter of E.C.C.I.

We will quote from the Open Letter to refresh our memories as to what was the situation in our Party at that time:

"Your Congress must mark a turning point in the determined application of the new line, and the radical transformation of the form of organisation and methods of work of the Party in order that it may play the leading rôle in the growing class struggles.

"Your Congress is called upon to make a final and decisive break with the opportunist hesitations and vacil-

\* See *Communist Policy in Britain*, obtainable from Workers' Bookshop.

lations of the past, to put an end to the present internal situation in the Party which is hampering its activities, and to bring it out on the broad road of becoming a mass organisation, the vanguard of the working class in the fight for the overthrow of capitalism.

"The E.C.C.I. is confident that the Congress will approach its tasks in a Leninist manner and enable the Party in the shortest possible time to become a decisive factor in the class struggle.

"The Communist Party of Great Britain must definitely understand that it is useless talking about a mass Bolshevik Party, about the leading rôle of the Party in the class struggle, unless it has close contact with the masses, unless it closely studies the mass economic and political struggles, unless it actually organises and leads these struggles, and unless it systematically, day in and day out, exposes the treacherous social-fascist rôle of the 'Labour' Government and its henchmen.

The Communist Party must become the focus, the political expression and the organiser of the growing mass protest movement and struggle, against the 'Labour' Government. The Communist Party must become transformed from a merely propagandist organisation into the independent leader of the economic and political struggles of the working class."\* (Open Letter of the E.C.C.I. to the Eleventh Party Congress, C.P.G.B.)

But there was also another important political question the Open Letter took up. It was the question of a daily paper. For years the C.I. had insisted upon a daily paper in Britain, but the difficulties had always been exaggerated, and few concrete steps taken to make a Communist daily a possibility.

The Leeds Congress elected a new Central Committee, and an immediate improvement in the work of the Party became evident. The whole Party was now firmly united on the line of the C.I. On the first of January, 1930, we launched the *Daily Worker*. The daily has played a tremendous rôle in every working class struggle since that time. Its continued existence has been described as "a working class miracle." It has gathered to its support thousands of workers who consistently support the paper, by the heaviest financial sacrifices. In the four years of its existence it has been subject to continual attacks by the Government, Employers and Labour leaders. But it lives, it pays its part, and in spite of its shortcomings and weaknesses, it undoubtedly wields a political influence, that has greatly strengthened the mass influence of the Party in every phase of the class struggle.

From 1930 the Party, with the help of the C.I., has earnestly striven to improve its work and overcome some of its greatest defects and weaknesses. It has participated actively in every economic struggle, and made improvements in the work of preparation for the economic struggle. It launched a big united front movement in 1930-31, around the demands of the Workers' Charter.

It fiercely fought against the whole policy of the National Government from the day of its in-

ception. The comrades associated with the *Daily Worker* were sentenced to penal servitude for the work of the Party in supporting the Invergordon Mutiny. In the big unemployed battles of the autumn of 1931, the Party played a big part, both in its support of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement and its independent agitation. Scores of our members were arrested in this period, but the work of the Party became increasingly respected, as a result of the activities that were being carried out.

But the Party was still unable to win decisive sections of the reformist workers, we were still unable to convincingly prove there was an alternative both to the National Government and the propaganda for a Third Labour Government. This fact was brought out in an alarming manner by the General Election results of 1931.

#### The "January" Resolution.

The National Government swept the country, the Labour vote very heavily declined, but the Communist vote was practically stagnant. This gave rise to serious discussion in our Central Committee and the Communist International. In December, 1931, there was a special discussion with the C.I. on the British situation. This discussion was reported to the Central Committee of the Party, and on its basis, a resolution was drawn up, which is popularly known in our Party as the January Resolution.\* We consider this resolution one of the most important Party documents, and one that can be accepted now as an indispensable guide to the whole party. We will quote from the Resolution because it expresses so clearly what at that time (and to some extent still) were the chief shortcomings of our Party:

"At the same time it must be stated that though the Labour Government for years past has carried out a policy opposed to the interests of the working class it was still able to rally the bulk of the British proletariat (6½ million votes). Our Party, however, did not even succeed in winning over in elections those sections of the workers who were disillusioned with the Labour Party and withheld their votes. We did not understand how to expose before the eyes of the workers the Labour Party's pretence that the policy of British Reformism is a weapon in the struggle against the offensive of the British bourgeoisie and a buffer against the attacks on the British working class."

"During the past months the Party has shown considerable activity in some fields of mass work (unemployed movement and mass demonstrations). But it cannot be sure of any solid influence among the masses unless it sees to it, first, that throughout all its mass work the demarcation in principle between its line and the reformist line is expressed in the clearest terms, and, secondly, that its mass influence is rooted above all in the factories and trade unions."

"The greatest defect in the Party's work during the

\* Published in the Report of the Eleventh Congress C.P.G.B., obtainable from Workers' Bookshop.

\* Resolution of C.C. Workers' Bookshop, Ltd.

past few years is that it has not carried on any systematic revolutionary mass work in the reformist trade unions."

"An end must be put to this situation immediately by making a decisive change in our work. The necessity for this change must be hammered into the consciousness of every Party organ and every single Party member. Without a determined buckling down to the daily systematic struggle with the masses against the reformist trade union bureaucracy in all trade union branches and factories the Communist Party can never become a real mass Party."

"The entire daily work of the Party, as well as all political and economic movements of the workers under the leadership of the C.P. must be conducted from the standpoint of continual concrete explanation to the workers of the revolutionary way out of the crisis. For this purpose, the Party must make a thorough study of the problems of the revolutionary way out." (C.C. Resolution, January, 1932.)

A big effort was made to get the entire Party mobilised to carry out this resolution, and whilst we did not succeed in this entirely, wherever the Resolution was applied, immediate gains were recorded and many invaluable experiences were gained. In particular, it became noticeable that in those meetings where serious efforts were made to show what concretely the revolutionary way out of the crisis for the British workers meant an entirely new meaning and understanding of Communism and the Communist Party became evident. There was a keen desire to discuss the question, good sales of pamphlets, manifestoes, etc., dealing with this were secured.

In trade union work, where it was carried out, successes could be achieved, which only emphasised what could be done if the line of the January resolution was really put into operation by the whole Party. Significant movements were taking place amongst rank and file trade unionists. There were tremendous opportunities before the Party, if there was a really serious effort made to overcome this refusal or reluctance to take part in revolutionary mass work in the trade unions.

Amongst the unemployed the Party was very active at this time, and in particular during the great Hunger March on London in November, 1932, if the same activity could be got in the trade unions, freed either from right opportunism, legalism or left sectarianism, then it was clear our Party could lead the way for the formation of effective rank and file movements in the unions, and the broadening of this work in such a way as to open up splendid prospects for the development of a nation-wide opposition movement that could exert a powerful influence inside the reformist trade unions. It could lead the way in the unification of wage struggles, shorter hours movement, and for the working out of a common lead, policy and strategy, such as would command the support of big sections of trade unionists in every industry.

Accordingly this question was made one of the main ones prior to the Twelfth Party Congress in

December, 1933, together with the fundamental questions that arise from the popularisation of the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

The Twelfth Congress gave a clear decision on these questions, and serious efforts have since been made to carry the decisions into practice, and good results have been achieved.

The Party has carried out consistent efforts to develop united front activity. The German events in 1933, made a great impression on the British working class. The Party addressed an appeal for united action to the Labour Party, Trades Union Congress, Co-operative Party and I.L.P.

This appeal was distributed in mass quantities all over the country. There was good support amongst the rank and file, but only the I.L.P. responded to our appeal. The other organisations refused. The Party and the I.L.P. carried out a number of united front demonstrations which met with a warm response.\* At the same time, many members of the Labour Party began to take part in united front activity, especially in connection with the campaign for the Relief of the Victims of German Fascism, for the Release of the Reichstag Prisoners and for the Release of Comrade Thaelman.

But the weakness of our united front activity then and now is that not sufficient persistent efforts are made to make contacts with the local Labour Parties, trade union members, Co-operative Guilds, and endeavour to draw them into various forms of mass activity that can lead to wider developments of united front work.

The great possibilities in this direction, were strikingly revealed during the Hunger March and Campaign for the United Front Congress at Berrymondsey this year.

In spite of the ban of the reformist leaders, there was a splendid response by the rank and file of the reformist organisations, in town after town working class organisations gave the Marchers a welcome, supported them, appointed delegates to the Unity Congress. The Congress itself was a triumph.

The Party had consistently given a lead both to the March and to the Congress discussion. It issued a manifesto to the Congress, that was warmly received, and in this campaign our Party undoubtedly played a leading rôle and won big influence.

During the March and Congress campaign, Local Unity Committees, Solidarity Committees were being set up everywhere, and there existed tremendous possibilities for the wide extension of the united front. But after the Congress and March was over, in spite

\* N.B.—We are not dealing in this article with other questions of the Party and the I.L.P., as they have been the subject of many recent articles in the C.I. Magazine.

of a good reporting campaign that was carried out the typical mistake that has been made time and time again in Britain has been made again, namely, to look on the Congress as a thing in itself, and not as the beginning of the campaign that could lead to a united front movement firmly based in the factories and local working-class organisations.

#### United Action.

Our Party must take its share of responsibility for this situation. The situation was such that if there had been consistent leadership of the campaign to carry out the Congress decisions, nationally, in the districts and localities, I am convinced that by now we will have developed such a movement for united action that, after the united front agreement in France that has been reached and the general desire there is amongst the masses for united action, it would have been much more difficult to reject our last appeal for united action made in July to the reformist leaders.

One of the most important tasks now before our Party is to at once remedy this weakness and get the campaign going as never before, especially against the New Unemployment Act, which is such a menace to the unemployed and employed workers. And if this is related to the fight for the winter demands of the unemployed, a new impetus can be given to the whole campaign.

But not only that. Our Party's last United Front Appeal to the reformist organisations must not be allowed to remain a paper appeal. Because of the refusal of the Labour leaders to take part, this is not to mean the end of the campaign. Their refusal and its implications must be ceaselessly explained to the reformist workers. Close personal contacts should be established with them in the factories, trade unions, local Labour Parties and Co-op. Guilds. These workers can be won for united action, especially can they be won for united activity against fascism.

The events in Germany and Austria have left a lasting impression on the British workers. There is deep resentment at the spineless attitude of the reformist leaders, both in their refusal to actively fight by every weapon of mass action, the fascist trend of all National Government legislation and repressive acts, and the fascism advocated by Mosley. Against Mosley's Blackshirts there is the bitterest hostility which is manifested in every town in which he appears, which reached its high-water mark in the anti-fascist demonstration against Mosley on September 9th in London.

The last meeting of our Central Committee gave this question great attention, as we believe the Party has an opportunity of leading the anti-fascist struggle in such a way as can and will lead to the development of the most powerful and effective

forms of united action. We will give the main points of the C.C. resolutions dealing with these questions, as they represent the line which the Party is now actively endeavouring to carry out. The resolution shows the menace of fascism in England as follows:

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

There is still, however, widespread confusion on the issue of fascism in Britain."

This confusion follows from the lack of understanding the two-fold character of the fascist attack in England.

"Finance capital at present backs the National Government as its main weapon for fascisation, like Brüning in Germany; but at the same time gives Mosley lavish support, and utilises his gangs as a subsidiary weapon, which will be rapidly brought to the front, in proportion, as the National Government, proves insufficient and if the workers' upward movement continues.

"The National Government offensive and the Mosley offensive supplement each other; the Blackshirts can only operate under the protection of the police, but at the same time can be used, and subsequently disavowed, where it would be inconvenient to use the police."

The resolution states that it is essential to make clear to the workers this two-fold character of the fascist offensive in order to destroy

"the 'democratic' illusion, the illusion of the possibility of legal bourgeois-democratic opposition to fascism."

Further, the resolution points out concretely the character of the social-fascist rôle of the reformist Labour leaders, that is not yet sufficiently clear to the workers. The resolution states that

"the British Labour Party remains as the only leading party of the old Second International which still maintains the old reactionary policy and prevents the united front of the working class."

Concerning the methods of struggle with fascism the resolution states:

"It is not yet widely enough realised that the line of passivity, of trust in legal defences, of trust in the capitalist state, as preached by the Labour leaders and as was preached by German Social-Democracy, is fatal and can only lead to the victory of fascism; and that only active mass opposition can defeat fascism, already in the early stages, before it is strong.

But it is no less important for it to be understood that this active mass anti-fascist movement must be a political movement, not merely a specialised defence force, but a political mass movement and campaign, exposing the claims of the fascists, enlightening opinion as to their true character, at the same time as resisting and defeating their violence.

The immediate demands and slogans of the fight against fascism at the present stage must be: dissolution of the Blackshirt Army! No toleration for Blackshirt hooligan gangs! No extended police powers over meetings and demonstrations! Withdraw the Sedition Bill!

The resolution points out that

"the real struggle against capitalism to-day, both in the economic and in the political field, against the offensive of fascism and war, requires not passive hopes in future electoral victories, but the MASS UNITED FRONT OF ALL THE WORKERS for the present struggle.

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

The resolution calls the workers' attention to the lessons of the events in Germany and Austria, calls upon them to follow the example of France, where the pressure of all active workers (Socialist and Communist) destroyed the resistance of the Social-Democratic leadership for the formation of the united front.

"The example of the French working class is a model to the workers of the world."

The resolution states:

"The resistance of the reformist Labour leadership must be and can be overcome by the pressure of the entire working class. The united front must be achieved in Britain. The entire future of the British working class struggle hangs on this.

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

"The aim of the united front campaign must be, not merely the holding of joint demonstrations and agitation, but the building of a mighty all-embracing mass organisation capable of fighting the offensive of fascism and war.

"This mass front against fascism and war must embrace, not only the working class organisations as the central core, but all unorganised workers, and all elements of the petty-bourgeoisie, employees, small traders, technicians, professionals, intellectuals, students and even bourgeois liberal elements that are prepared to enter into the common fight against fascism and war under the leadership of the working class."

"The existing wave of feeling must not be allowed to ebb away, but must be utilised to lead to lasting organisation."

"The anti-fascist front should be built up at a wide all-embracing anti-fascist Congress, uniting the political working class parties, the trade unions, the co-operatives, the unemployed organisations, the working class youth organisations, the working class women's organisations, progressive women's organisations, students' organisations, professional groupings, Jewish anti-Hitler groupings, previously existing anti-fascist and anti-war organisations, progressive anti-fascist organisations, etc.

"The core of the anti-fascist front should be built up in the localities, in the factories and in the streets."

We believe that the experiences gained in the period since the 6th Congress of the C.I. will enable our Party to adequately carry out this line, and at the same time eradicate some of the existing weaknesses of our Party work. To make a final break with being closed in and with our ideological and political narrowness, to strive for more effective preparation and participation in economic struggles. To achieve a quicker reaction to all political events and give the correct and timely lead to the workers on these events. To improve the content and circulation of the *Daily Worker*, and to transform our agitation and propaganda

into the most powerful weapons for winning the workers to the Communist Party.

In this connection we believe the Party programme that is now being drafted and discussed will fulfil a big omission in our Party work and that its publication and popularisation will be the means of clearly demonstrating that there is an alternative to the policy of the National Government and of the Labour Party, that the revolutionary way out of the crisis is the only concrete and practical solution of the problems facing the workers to-day.

In the fight against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union the Party has carried out a consistent struggle to rouse the masses for action. It has given the fullest support both to the Friends of the Soviet Union and the anti-war movement. In the campaign and war of Japan in Manchuria and China the Party has shown the meaning of this predatory action, not only as the beginning of the revision of the world markets and the opening of a new imperialist war, but as constituting the most deadly menace to the Soviet Union, in which Japan has been acting in the closest conjunction with the National Government.

Against the war preparations of the National Government the Party has been active, but after reviewing all that has been done by meetings, conferences, *Daily Worker*, leaflets and pamphlets, it all falls far short of what the acute war situation demands.

#### Anti-War Action.

WE HAVE NOT SUCCEEDED IN GETTING ONE SHORT PROTEST MOVEMENT IN ANY MUNITIONS FACTORY, AT ANY RAIL DEPOT OR SEAPORT, HANDLING MUNITIONS. We have seen splendid anti-war conferences such as Bermondsey in 1933, and the Youth Anti-War Conference in Sheffield in 1934, but the above outstanding fact of our inability to get a single stoppage of munitions, especially those going to the Far East, is a disquieting fact when one remembers the speed and rapidity with which war is being prepared by the National Government, and the present provocative acts of Japan in the Far East, against the Soviet Union.

Such a situation must spur the Party to redouble its efforts, especially in the munitions and transport centres to rouse the workers to an acute realisation of the war danger, and the need of knowing how to fight war before it breaks out. In this connection there is a great need to obtain better and more concise information on what is going on in the war factories—where the munitions are going to, what they consist of, their death-dealing capacity, so as to maintain a constant fire of publicity on this question, and also afford more concrete opportunities of concentration at particu-

lar factories and transport depots. It is necessary to stress the experiences of the last war time and time again; the international effects of the stopping of the Jolly George in 1920, and how such a repetition to-day would have the most tremendous effects throughout the world.

A ten-minutes' protest stoppage in a war factory making munitions for Japan, or a short hold-up on the railways or at the docks, would have incalculable effects and soon lead to more effective forms of action in the fight against imperialist war and in defence of the Soviet Union. Such forms of action would be worth a hundred meetings and conferences, and to achieve this is now one of the most urgent tasks before our Party and the anti-war movement.

There must also be a better popularisation of the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union, this enormous weapon in our hands which is the chief factor in the international situation retarding war, giving the whole working class the badly needed time to prepare to meet the deadly menace of war.

But the biggest and most serious weakness of the Party must also now be resolutely overcome; this is the slow growth of the Party. The problem is not the hostility of the masses to Communism, is not the obstacles and difficulties placed in our way by the existence of reformist illusions, the slow growth of the Party is our responsibility. Until, from top to bottom of the Party, there is the convinced determination and desire to recruit for the Party, then no progress will ever be made.

As it is, recruiting for the Party seems to always be an afterthought, even if that. We don't feel sufficiently alarmed at the numerical weakness of the Party. This is all the more serious when there is such an interest in Communism, when the influ-

ence and prestige of the Party stands higher than at any time since its formation. When our meetings are well attended, financial response is good, our leads being carried out by an increasing number of workers, when in important districts like London, Glasgow and South Wales our Party is now a definite political factor in the life of these places, it is a matter of grave and serious concern that the membership does not increase by leaps and bounds in these circumstances.

The fault is entirely ours. The coming discussions must sharply emphasise that an end must be put to such an intolerable situation at all costs. Once inside the ranks of the Party itself, THE WILL to recruit out of every phase of daily activity is there, then the recruits will speedily be found, and the Communist Party develop into a real mass Party heading the whole struggle of the working class.

The resolution of our August Plenum represents a really serious effort to give a clear lead on the present situation and some of the most important problems that face the Party. Let us note its concluding words:

"The entire work of the Party is directed towards development of revolutionary leadership and mass organisation in preparation for the decisive revolutionary issues which we know to be in front.

"For this reason all the work of the Party, both great and small, must be imbued with this understanding and perspective, with awakening the workers to the necessity of the revolutionary path as the sole solution to the crisis, the path of the working class revolution and Soviet Power.

"The united front, which is the necessary next stage in the advance of the working class struggle in Britain, is itself only a stage to the further mass advance to the overthrow of capitalism in Britain.

"To this developing battle, leading to the final victory of Socialism, the Communist Party calls the working class."

---

## Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

---

The following pamphlets have been published :

THESES AND DECISIONS ... ..	32 pages 2d.
WE ARE FIGHTING FOR A SOVIET GERMANY, by Wilhelm Pieck ...	100 ,, 4d.
THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES, by O. Piatnitsky ... ..	100 ,, 4d.
REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS, FASCISM AND WAR, by D. Z. Manuilsky ...	44 ,, 3d.
FASCISM, SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND THE COMMUNISTS, by V. Knorin	52 ,, 3d.
REVOLUTIONARY CHINA TO-DAY, by Wang Ming and Kan Sing ...	128 ,, 6d.
FASCISM, THE WAR DANGER, AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES, by O. W. Kuusinen ... ..	120 ,, 6d.

Complete. Bound in Cloth. 3/6 post free.

MODERN BOOKS LIMITED

46 Theobald's Road, London, W.C.1.

# THE BRITISH TRADES UNION CONGRESS AT WEYMOUTH

By A. LOSOVSKY.

**T**HE British Trades Unions are the oldest workers' organisations in the world. They have existed for about 150 years, during which they have accumulated a tremendous amount of experience. It would seem that at such a respected age the Trade Union Congress should be able to give a reply with a wisdom worthy of its years to the problems facing the British working class.

In reality the 66th Trades Union Congress, despite the boasted practicability of its leaders, did not want to see actual things, did not take account of the real sacrifices and the real relationship of forces, but occupied itself with expressing pious wishes, the carrying out of which the Congress left to the good will of the ruling classes. The crisis which has considerably impoverished the working class, the growth of fascism, the approaching war, all occupied a place on the agenda of the Congress. The assembled delegates, under the leadership of the General Council, did not consider it necessary to raise the question as to the causes of the circumstances which have arisen, but mainly dodged round about these vital questions.

The Congress was not convened for the organisation of the struggle but to talk on the subject of how to get out of a blind alley in a peaceful manner. The peaceful, kindly and complacent calm of the Congress was momentarily disturbed by a few speeches from the revolutionary delegates, but these did not change the general picture. The capitalist press welcomed the decisions of this Congress as an expression of the wisdom of the tried leaders of the trade unions. It must be recognised that the British capitalists know their trade unions. Hence their mutual trust and satisfaction with each other.

## Fascism.

The Congress was, of course, unable to avoid the question of FASCISM. Firstly, fascism had conquered in Germany and the German colleagues of the British trade union officials had gone bankrupt, becoming the laughing-stock of the whole world. On the other hand, fascism was beginning to take root in Great Britain—and not only in the form of Mosley's Black Shirts. Fascism finds an expression in a number of laws by the Conservative government, which, concealing itself behind the flag of democracy, is increasing the pressure on the working class.

It would seem that the Congress should have raised the question of fascism definitely and sharply, and that the British trade unionists should have criticised the conduct of their German colleagues,

should have shown the British workers how to fight against the British fascists. That is what should have been done by people, at any rate, who claimed that they care for the interests of the working class. But the leaders of the Trades Union Congress acted in a very different way. They did not speak of the conduct of their German colleagues at all. They merely referred, in passing, to the question of the growth of fascism in Great Britain; and launched the whole force of their dissatisfaction on Hitler, Mussolini and Co. Was it worth while wasting so much powder and shot to prove that Hitler and Mussolini are killing and torturing workers? Was it worth while talking on this subject when every worker knows what the German and Italian fascists are? It would seem that the British trade unionists should have fought first of all against the British fascists. It would seem that the British trade unionists should have disclosed the causes of the collapse of the German trade union movement to the entire working class of Great Britain and drawn suitable conclusions. But the leaders of the Trade Union Congress preferred to evade this question.

Why did the question of the conduct of the leaders of the German trade unions not come under consideration by the organizers and leaders of the Congress? Because the leaders of the British trade unions had no objection to make to the policy of their German colleagues, because they were acting themselves in the same way as the leaders of the German trade unions had done.

In reality, had not the German trade union officials everywhere howled against dictatorship from the right or from the left? They had. Mr. Citrine did not think up anything original. He simply translated into English the things his German colleagues had said before him. The Trades Union Congress reiterated its belief in freedom and democracy. It stated that "great freedom and more effective democracy can only be secured by strengthening the trade unions, the Labour Party and the Co-operative Movement and by uniting the struggle of these three sections of the working class." Let us admit that the British trade unions, the Labour Party and the Co-operative Movement are still too weak to bring about "effective democracy," but German social-democracy, the German trade unions and the German Co-operative Societies were in their time powerful organisations. Why did things end with the smashing of the reformist trade unions in Germany? The leaders of the British trade unions pretend that they do not understand the

reasons. They pretend this so that the members of their trade unions shall not understand the essence of this question. Nevertheless, it is a very simple one. THE GERMAN TRADE UNIONS WERE SMASHED BECAUSE THEIR LEADERS CARRIED ON THE POLICY OF THE BRITISH TRADE UNIONS. THE BRITISH TRADE UNIONS ARE APPROACHING SERIOUS UPHEAVALS BECAUSE THEY ARE FOLLOWING THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE GERMAN TRADE UNIONS. This, for example, can be seen from the fact that Mr. Citrine denies the spread of fascism in Great Britain. He states that there is not, and will not be, any resemblance between the unemployed training camps in Great Britain, whatever the conditions in them, and the forced labour camps in Germany. He and his colleagues are for police protection for fascist meetings. He and his colleagues spoke against the anti-fascist demonstration appointed for September 9th. This means that the leaders of the British trade unions literally repeat word for word what their German colleagues formerly said. And they want to assure us that, for this very reason, the result will be better.

#### War.

If the British trade union leaders have taken the position of their German colleagues on the question of fascism, then on the question of WAR they have dragged out ancient finery and repeated what Barnes, Henderson and Shaw said and did during the World Imperialist War. The Congress first of all establishes in its resolution THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A DEFENSIVE AND OFFENSIVE WAR. It promises complete support to the British Government "in all the risks and consequences" connected with participation in collective measures against those who break the peace. But remembering that Britain may also be the one that violates peace, the resolution proposed by Henderson promises to call a "special Congress for discussing the best way out of the situation" if England is recognised as the aggressor. This resolution shows that the leaders of the British trade unions are giving carte blanche to the Conservative Government in advance. And this is in peace time! What will these gentlemen say when war actually begins? The thing becomes still more blatant when the resolution gets to the forms and methods of the struggle against war. Here we find a perfectly open abandonment of even the decision made by the previous Trade Union Congress. The resolution of the 66th Congress states:

"The absence of an independent trade union movement in countries like Germany, Italy, Austria and other countries makes it impossible to declare a general strike against the governments of those countries. In other countries like Japan, for example, the weakness of the trade union organisations makes it impossible for them to exert pressure on the government."

The position is therefore as follows: As the

Trade Unions of Germany, Austria, Italy and Japan cannot declare a general strike against war, the Trade Unions of Great Britain must support their government. In general, here, set out in different words, is the position of the leaders of the British trade unions on war which was branded so fiercely by Lenin during and after the world war.\*

One delegate was right in pointing out that this resolution is a step backwards from the position of last year's congress, that it says nothing about the U.S.S.R. and aims at "giving the trade unions sleeping sickness," thus making it easier for the conservative government to support Japan. But it was difficult to move the assembled delegates by pointing out such "trifles." The trade union leaders were resolved to show their patriotism and loyalty. They were resolved to show the British capitalists that they were, are and will remain the defenders of the capitalist fatherland, and moreover, they did this so openly that any mistake is impossible. All this took place at a moment when the British government is intriguing with Japan against the U.S.S.R., when the tenseness of international relations, as the result of the aggressive policy of Japan and Germany, has reached boiling point. Truly, no better service could have been rendered the Diehards!

#### The United Front.

THE UNITED FRONT also received the attention of the assembled delegates. But the speaker and the General Council's official orators did not consider it necessary to raise the question of the united front seriously, to explain its advantages, to concentrate the whole energy of the masses on resistance to the capitalist offensive. The thing in the united front which interested them was not the struggle against the capitalists, but the fact that it was a UNITED FRONT WITH THE COMMUNISTS. That was what worried them most of all! The united front with the Conservative Government for the defence of the imperialist interests of the British capitalists—this they understood; could agree to and regarded as their duty. But to create a united front with the Communists—this seemed to them absolutely inadmissible! The report of the general council which was discussed at the Congress condemns those Trades Councils which

"established the united front with organisations subordinate to the Communist Party."

The reporters were not interested in what the united front was formed for; on what basis; against whom it was directed. They were interested in only one question—how to avoid being in the united front with the Communists against the capitalists. It could be seen from the speeches, the discussion at the Congress and the actions of the trade unions,

\* See Little Lenin Library, *Socialism and War; War and the Second International*.

that the trade union leaders genuinely prefer the united front with the capitalists against the Communists, the revolutionary wing of the workers' movement.

To do the leaders of the trade unions justice, they talked of this openly, not wrapping their anti-Communist views and objections up in cloudy phrases. They consider that the Trade Unions, the Labour Party and the Co-operative Movement can do everything themselves. But even the British trade union leaders are liable to make a mistake! The demonstration on September 9th in Hyde Park showed that the little Communist Party carried large masses of organised workers with it in the struggle against fascism, although the Trade Unions, the Labour Party and the Co-operative Societies called on their members not to take part in this demonstration.

#### Wages.

The Congress at Weymouth had no time to deal with such prosaic questions as WAGES, although over two million workers in Great Britain are now demanding wage increases, which were discussed at the Congresses of the separate trade unions this summer. The Congress made a few decisions on SOCIAL INSURANCE, but—and this is the essence of the whole policy of the trade union leaders—it did not say what to do to abolish the old insurance law and create a better one. It is true that in its decisions the Congress points out one way for carrying out social insurance—a way which has been tried and tested in Great Britain already. The Trade Union Congress calls on the future Labour Government to repeal this law. But on what grounds can we feel sure that a third Labour Government will repeal this law? Do we not remember how the so-called Labour Government lengthened the working day for the miners, how it cut wages, how it supported strike-breakers in a number of strikes, etc.? What guarantees have we that the Labour Government will repeal this law? For, despite the refusal of the Labour Government to establish a shorter working day in the mines, it nevertheless continues to have the support of the trade unions. On what grounds can we suppose that the third Labour Government will be better than the first two? It will be better, say the trade union leaders, if it receives a majority of votes. (“Office” and “Power.”) But in Germany, the social-democratic government had a majority for quite a long time after the November Revolution. In Sweden the social-democratic government has a majority at present. Why have they given nothing to the working class? Evidently it is not merely a matter of obtaining a formal majority, but of the fact that the first and second Labour Governments of Great Britain preserved the inviolability of private property, and there are

no grounds for concluding that a third Labour Government will not occupy itself with this same pious matter! The appeal to the third Labour Government, the demagogic promises that the third Labour Government will make radical changes, must meet with strong resistance from the revolutionary workers. It may be objected that MacDonald and Thomas are no longer there, that they have gone over to the Conservatives, and that now the Labour Government will be more “left” without them. It is true that MacDonald and Thomas are no longer there, but their friends, their co-thinkers, Henderson and Co., still remain! On what grounds are we to suppose that the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission and the delegate of the Conservative Government to Geneva, Arthur Henderson, will be more radical than MacDonald on questions of home and foreign policy? There are no grounds for such supposition and there could not be.

\* \* \*

To distract the attention of the working masses from the difficult actual questions of modern life, the Congress occupied itself with the big questions of the “socialisation” of the iron and steel industry. The Congress adopted a resolution on the SOCIALISATION OF THE COTTON AND COAL INDUSTRIES. What is this socialisation of industry, as understood by the Trade Unionists? In essence, the proposal of the Trade Union Congress amounts to the TRUSTIFICATION OF ALL INDUSTRY, THE GREATER CONCENTRATION OF ALL INDUSTRY AND THE TRANSFER OF THE MANAGEMENT OF ALL INDUSTRY TO THE BIGGEST TRUSTS. Of course, united control, national ownership and control of all industry, self-government, responsible representatives, conditions of the workers, the development of the spirit of self-government, the right to participate in the control and management of industry, etc., all find a place in the resolution. But all this is extremely vague and indefinite. Who must socialise industry? And why must the capitalist agree to socialisation? But the decisions of the Congress take the consent of the capitalists to this proposal as their starting point. It is well known that capitalists only agree to combinations which given them an additional income. And if the Trades Union Congress calculates to obtain the agreement of the employers, this means that it is not averse to guaranteeing them an additional income compared with what they receive under the present form of management of industry. But these motives for “socialisation” are our old acquaintances! We heard this song of yore from the mouths of the leaders of the German trade unions. They also “socialised” industry, organised control, participated in the management of industry for long years. In reality this was merely empty talk, “socialisation” on paper, to throw dust in the eyes of the masses of

the working class. The English trade unionists know what German "socialisation" led to. The aim of the "socialisation" advanced by the Trade Union Congress at Weymouth is to convince the working masses that it is possible to carry out socialisation without the means of production passing into the hands of the workers, that socialisation is possible without revolution, without the expropriation of the expropriators, that a radical reconstruction of all industry is possible by the method of convincing the employers. We know how the German song on socialisation ended. Where is our guarantee that the British melody on the same theme will not lead to the same results ?

#### The Meaning of Weymouth.

How can we explain that the British Trades Union Congress refused to cover its Right actions by Left phrases? This is explained, above all, by the approach of the general election. The Trade Union leaders wanted to show the petty-bourgeoisie and the big "progressive" bourgeoisie that the coming of a Labour Government to power has nothing in common with revolution. What was it that caused uneasiness to the British bourgeoisie? The fact that the British trade unions decided in favour of a strike against war a year ago. To prove their loyalty to the interests of British imperialism, the leaders of the Trade Unions and the Labour Party repudiated the strike and announced that they would support their "own" country in case of a "defensive" war. The capitalists did not want the Congress to take up the struggle against British fascism seriously and thoroughly. The Trade Union leaders directed all their wrath against German fascism, and thus left their native fascists and the fascist measures of the Conservative Government in the background. The capitalists did not want the Congress to occupy itself seriously with the question of increased wages. The trade union leaders avoided this question, demonstrating their readiness to prove in practice the harmlessness of the future Labour Government for the ruling classes. By means of the decisions of the Congress, the leaders wanted to say to the capitalists :

"See how moderate and respectable we are. You have no need to fear a replacement of Conservatives by Labourites. We guarantee you the continuity of British policy and a loyalty to the Constitution and the pillars of Great Britain."

The meaning of the decisions cannot be understood in any other way.

This means that the trade union leaders considered it unnecessary to conceal their smug patriotic face. There was no change in type in the policy of the trade union leaders. There was a more open exposition of their policy in view of the approaching general elections. Thus and only thus is it possible

to explain the political meaning of the Weymouth Congress. But this means that the break between the upper ranks and the rank and file of the Trade Unions has deepened still further. In reality, while the Trade Union leaders think it necessary to demonstrate their deep loyalty to the capitalist system, the Trade Union members are displaying an ever-greater readiness to fight for an improved standard of living, a readiness to fight against fascism. The demonstration on September 9th was a brilliant example of the gulf which separates the lower trade union organisations from their leaders. Can the decisions of the Weymouth Congress bridge this gulf? There is no basis for such a supposition. On the contrary, the Trade Union members will be profoundly disappointed by this Congress. They will be deceived in their hopes and begin to seek for a way out along new revolutionary lines. It could not be otherwise. The gap between the upper and lower ranks of the trade unions cannot help but increase in those places where the trade union leaders want to cast the entire workers' movement in the reformist mould. Here the class struggle is replaced by loyal expectation, all the workers' demands are postponed until electoral victories by the Labour Party, and all plans are based on working in common with the "progressive" capitalists and the many forms of class collaboration. Everything depends on our activity in the trade unions. Everything depends on how the revolutionary workers are able to utilise these conditions for drawing the trade union members over to the side of the class struggle.

#### Are Trade Union Leaders Fascists?

The Congress of the British Trades Unions at Weymouth could freely cook its reformist brew because there was an insignificant revolutionary opposition at the Congress. Only 5-6 delegates spoke against the official attitude; the translation of the theory and practice of the German trade unions into English. The opposition was too weak to properly brand the policy of the trade union leaders. This is an important question for Great Britain. It is plain that discontent is growing among the masses. Everyone knows that deep down among the British trade unionists this dissatisfaction is becoming extremely sharp. But why has the opposition been so weak up till now? Why have the British trade union leaders been able to carry on their policy, which has already led the British proletariat to severe defeats and will do so in the future? Because the REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS, MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY ARE NOT ALL MEMBERS OF TRADE UNIONS; BECAUSE NOT ALL THOSE WHO ARE IN TRADE UNIONS WORK THERE IN A PLANNED MANNER, SEEKING TO WIN POSITIONS IN THE TRADE UNIONS, BECAUSE AMONG OUR COMRADES IN GREAT BRITAIN *there still*

*exist a* NUMBER OF INCORRECT CONCEPTIONS which prevent our penetration into the midst of the trade unionists.

On the one hand, there are Communists who think that they should act in trade unions in such a way as not to hurt the feelings of the leaders, that they should adapt themselves to the tactics and policy of the General Council. Hence they keep quiet at the meetings of the local branches, at the Congresses of the various unions, in respect to our revolutionary aims and tasks, our tactics; hence some of the speeches are entirely colourless. On the other hand, there still exist tendencies to underestimate the significance and role of the trade unions in the labour movement in Great Britain. Comrades forget that the trade unions are the oldest and most influential workers' organisations in Great Britain, that they carry not only their members but masses of unorganised workers with them, and that failure to work in the trade unions, or a conciliatory attitude to it is a CRIME AGAINST THE WORKING CLASS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

It is necessary to know exactly what the Labour Party is, and the Trade Union leaders are like, to carry on revolutionary work in the trade unions in a useful way for the British proletariat. An incorrect approach to this may hinder our work of liberating masses from reformist illusions. And the fact that such incorrect views exist can be seen, for example, from the last article of Comrade Mahon in the "Labour Monthly" on the Trade Union Congress. We read in this article that

"the bureaucracy of the labour movement in this country has learnt nothing from the events in Germany and Austria" (which is true). "They are doing more than repeat the policy of their colleagues in those countries" (this is already an exaggeration).

They

"offer themselves to the bourgeoisie, as able and capable to do the work which the National Socialist mass party in Germany accomplished" (but this is altogether incorrect).

What is meant by the last statement? That the Labourites and the Trade Union leaders are the same as the National Socialists in Germany. This statement shows that many comrades do not yet understand the difference between social-fascism and fascism, though the 12th and 13th Plenums of the E.C.C.I.\* explained the difference popularly and in great detail. To say that the labour leaders, the leaders of the Trade Unions, of the Labour Party, are the same as the German fascists, means to put oneself in a ridiculous position before the members of these organisations. It means to cut off the path to these masses, because the members of the Labour Party and the Trade Unions, however bad their opinion of their leaders,

nevertheless cannot agree (and quite correctly) that that Labourites and the Trade Union leaders are the same as the National Socialists. And then, who wants such a theory? What use is it, and what can it give to the Labour Movement of Great Britain and our Party? It is true that the Labourites and Trade Union leaders are clearing the path for fascism. As they do not fight against fascism, nor mobilise the working class against the fascist measures of the Conservative government; lumping dictatorship from the right and from the left together, and fighting against the united front, THEY ARE CLEARING THE PATH FOR FASCISM. But does this mean that they are fascists themselves? No, it does not. Our comrades in Great Britain must understand this and not write sentiments in an influential magazine which only hinder the revolutionary workers from coming closer to the masses of the organised workers of Great Britain.

\* \* \*

Trades Union Congresses are extremely important events in Great Britain. Both the workers and the bourgeoisie pay great attention to them, for in Great Britain the trade unions have enormous weight. They have many advantages and therefore we have the right to demand a great deal from them.

The Weymouth Congress took place under the banner of struggle against the united front. The leaders of the British trade unions are more responsible than any others for the fact that a resolution hostile to the united front, demanding the dissolution of all revolutionary trade-union organisations, and the Red International of Labour Unions., was introduced in the General Council of the Amsterdam International which met at Weymouth on the eve of the Trades Union Congress. The idea of this ridiculous resolution permeated the work of the Congress of the British trade unions in Weymouth.

Instead of bringing their own weaknesses to light, the causes for the destruction of the Trade Unions in Germany and Austria, and admitting the bankruptcy of their own policy and tactics; the General Council of the Amsterdam International, under the leadership of Citrine, the leader of the British Trade Unions, proposed that all the revolutionary Trade Unions and the R.I.L.U. should dissolve, i.e., should admit the unlawfulness of their own existence and bow down to the political bankrupts. Can we take a serious attitude to such decisions? Of course not!

While the revolutionary trade unions in all countries are under the hurricane of fire from the capitalists, and the revolutionary T.U. movement has been driven underground in a number of countries, the Amsterdam International, at the head of which stand the British trade unionists, DEMANDS THE DISSOLUTION OF OUR REVOLUTIONARY ORGANISATIONS,

\* See Reports, published by Modern Books, Ltd.

I.E., THEY COME TO THE AID OF THE CAPITALISTS. At present, the British trade union leaders are not only answerable for the policy of the British trade union movement, but also for the policy of the Amsterdam International, because the British Trades Union Congress number about half the members of the entire Amsterdam International. As the strongest organisation of the Amsterdam International, the Trades Union Congress determines its policy, tactics and decisions. It plays a leading part and must therefore take the responsibility. Though the Amsterdam leaders demand the dissolution of the revolutionary trade union organisations, the R.I.L.U.

does not present such a demand to the reformist unions. We do not demand the dissolution of the reformist Trade Unions. We propose the united front of the revolutionary and reformist trade unions in the struggle against the capitalists. In a number of countries we sharply raised the question of the UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT ON THE BASIS OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE. This comparison alone testifies to the fact that the Amsterdam International is continuing its splitting policy, while the R.I.L.U. is stubbornly and systematically continuing its policy of the united front and the unity of the trade union movement.

## THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMPANY UNIONS

By B. SHERMAN.

**S**INCE the N.R.A. the company unions in the United States have grown very rapidly and have been assigned an increasingly important rôle by the employers and the government to head off the powerful movement for the organisation of the workers into trade unions and to smash the big strike struggles which have been sweeping the country. Before the N.R.A., the company unions had a membership of 1,263,000. To-day it is estimated that they have a membership of three to five million, embracing 85 per cent. of the steel workers, 50 per cent. of the railway shopmen, and large sections in the motor-car, rubber and other important industries. These company unions are organised either directly or indirectly by the employers, and by various means of compulsion force all or the majority of the workers to belong and to pay dues. They usually take the form of benefit associations for mutual aid, insurance, etc. (which is effective only while the worker is employed in the factory). At other times they masquerade under the name of "employee-representation committees," or "employee-shop committees." "Elections" are held under the watchful eye of the employer, who sometimes uses marked ballots to blacklist any workers who show opposition to the company slate; in the Republic Steel Mill in Youngstown, every ballot bears the worker's badge number. The leading committee to which elections are held is usually a joint board consisting (supposedly) of an equal number of workers' representatives and employers' representatives; through intimidation and trickery, however, the company manages to have only loyal company tools elected. In the U.S. Steel Corporation mines, gunmen were used to supervise the elections. Even if, in rare instances, honest workers are elected, the presence

of the employers' agents either intimidates them from taking up the workers' grievances, or blocks any action on those grievances discussed. Quite often, the workers, as in the Bendix Aircraft Company, are required to join the company union as a condition of employment, and dues are deducted from their wages (check-off system).

The bourgeoisie, fearing that the A.F. of L. leaders would not be able to hold the masses in check, has followed a policy of giving simultaneous recognition to the company unions, even in those industries where the A.F. of L. unions have been granted a certain amount of recognition. The N.R.A. code authorities have given open recognition to company unions, as did statements by the N.R.A. heads, Johnson and Richberg, and decisions of the Labour Boards. An example is the decision of a Regional Labour Board, in the case of a Rochester packing-house, where the dismissal of workers who resisted the company union was upheld on the grounds that these workers were "inefficient." To render these organisations more palatable to the workers, the employers have made a gesture of "democratising" them, to give the outward impression that they are free from company control. This was especially true in railroad and steel. An example is in the Pennsylvania Railroad shops at Altoona; the constitution and by-laws of the company union were changed, and did not carry the signatures of the company officials, but those of "dummies" instead. Instead of the company bearing the entire expense, which appears on their books, a system of dues-payments was set up to make it look as if the men had formed a "voluntary" organisation—\$1.00 monthly for mechanics and 50 cents for others. The Wagner Labour Disputes Bill, which was intro-

duced into the last session of Congress, and the Labour Adjustment Act which was finally adopted, shows that the intention of the Roosevelt government was to strengthen the company unions, in spite of the fact that the N.R.A. was hailed by the A.F. of L. officials and the leaders of the Socialist Party as guaranteeing the workers' right to organise into trade unions of their own choice.

#### The Workers and Company Unions.

One of the main features of the present strike wave is that it is directed against the company unions and for the right to organise. A few results of ballots taken at random show the workers' attitude to the company unions; Pacific Fruit Express R.R.—1,313 for the trade union, 260 for the company union; Colorado Southern Railroad, a three-to-one vote against the company union; Richfield, a three-to-one vote against the company union; Cleveland Welding—163 against, two for the company union. In the company union elections in the sheet mill of Inland Steel in Indiana Harbour, only 10 per cent. of the workers participated, the rest refused to vote.

The growth of company unionism confronts the American Party with a most serious task. While we cannot mechanically characterise the company unions as fascist organisations, they can very easily become the base for further fascist development in the United States. Our task is to organise a struggle against company unions, and to win the workers in these organisations for the class struggle, and for the organisation of the workers into genuine trade unions. But we have said this many times before. What is necessary is to examine the tactics we have used in the past, and see what has hindered us from organising an effective struggle against the company unions.

The resolution of the eighth Party Convention has, in the main, stated our tasks regarding the fight against company unions correctly. It has indicated the necessity of working inside them to win over the workers and expose the company unions as instruments of the employers. But in the practice of the Party and the revolutionary unions there have been tendencies which led to the neglect of work inside the company unions. These were expressed in such formulations as "Smash the company unions," and "Boycott the company union elections," which in practice led away from working inside these organisations and in the factories on which they are based. In the Calumet region the Steel and Metal Workers' Industrial Union told the steel workers to boycott the elections. In Pittsburgh district, tendencies still exist to repeat these formulations.

Where the revolutionary unions did, however,

carry on work in the company union elections by putting up slates of militant workers, important successes were gained and in many instances the slates of the revolutionary union were elected to the leading organs of the company union; a number of such examples were shown by the Steel and Metal Workers' Industrial Union in the recent elections in the steel industry. In company union elections at the Shenango-Penn Mill in Sharpsville, two of three representatives elected were members of the Steel and Metal Workers' Industrial Union, and ran openly as such. In the Republic steel mill in Youngstown, where the ballots were marked with the workers' badge number, many workers defied the company's intimidation and voted with the sticker distributed by the Industrial Union, stating:

"I vote against the company union and for the recognition of a real union."

In the mills in the Gary area, candidates endorsed by the Industrial Union were nominated for the final election. In the National Tube Mills, a young militant was elected president of the company union. These experiences could be multiplied many times by the more energetic work of the Party and the revolutionary unions.

But to elect militant workers into the organs of the company unions is not sufficient. A concrete programme for work inside these organisations is necessary, utilising all legal, semi-legal, and illegal possibilities of work in them, where such demands are raised as will develop a struggle of the workers against the form of company unionism itself. Some of these are calling general meetings of the workers to discuss grievances and putting forward demands on wages, hours of labour, and other questions; the exclusion of the company representatives from the workers' meetings and from the leading organs of the company union; the workers to have the right to use the funds of the company union, or at least to control and account for them; against the compulsory dues (check-off) system. Others are: for the formation of commissions to investigate conditions of women's and children's labour; participation in the struggle for social insurance; for a poll of the workers to decide which union they prefer with workers' supervision of the polling-booths and the counting of votes to insure a secret ballot without intimidation, marked ballots, etc.

#### Company Union Elections.

When the company union elections take place, slates of militant workers who have influence in the factories should be nominated, with the aim of electing them to leading posts. During the period leading up to the elections, immediate demands should be raised which will answer the needs of the workers in the factory, and also a demand

against the interference of the company management in the workers' affairs. Generally, the Party and revolutionary unions should not advocate the boycott of company union elections, as even an effective boycott, where the company union already exists, cannot possibly gain as much for the workers as effective participation in the elections and winning of the leading posts in the company unions. There may be cases, of course, where the sentiments of the workers in the factory are against participation in these elections, and they utilise this elementary form of struggle against the company union. Here it must be the task of the Party and the red trade unions to prepare the groundwork for participation in the elections by explaining clearly to the workers that this passive form of resistance to the company unions is insufficient to defeat them. They must convince them of the necessity of actively participating in the voting and election of trustworthy militant candidates to leading posts, bringing the older workers forward especially, who, by virtue of their long service in the factory, have great influence among the workers.

If such a militant slate has obtained a majority in the elections, and if the majority of the workers in the factory have participated in the voting, the workers' representatives in the leading committee of the company union should take steps to convert this elected organ into a factory committee of the workers, functioning without the presence of the company representatives. Upon the strengthening of the position and authority of the factory committee among the workers, the question should be raised of transforming the company union into a genuine trade union, or affiliating it to an already existing trade union. Whether this is to be a revolutionary union, independent, or a union affiliated to the American Federation of Labour, will of course depend on the given situation in that particular factory, locality and industry.

#### **United Front Against Formation.**

In factories where the employers are attempting to form a company union, it is necessary to organise a united front struggle, together with the trade union organisations, Socialist workers, fraternal organisations, etc., against this attempt and against the compulsory enrolment of workers into a com-

pany union of either the old or new "democratised" type. The demand must be raised for the right of the workers to join any union of their own choice, the establishment of elected factory committees and their recognition by the employers, who are not to be admitted into these organs representing the workers. The most varied forms of struggle must be developed against the formation of company unions, including the organisation of workers' meetings and protest strikes against any attempt to force the workers to join them or pay dues. There may be exceptional cases where the employer attempts to establish a company union, and the sentiments of the masses of workers are so much against it, that it is possible to organise an effective boycott of the company union elections which will hinder, or even prevent, its establishment in the factory, or at least discredit its authority. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude from this that we should advocate a boycott of company union elections in factories where the company unions exist.

The work in the company unions must go on parallel with a systematic campaign in our press, through leaflets, and at workers' meetings, against the form of company unionism, exposing it as an instrument of the employers to prevent the organisation of a genuine class trade union organisation which will fight for the workers' interests. In order to better bring this forward clearly to the workers we must raise such concrete questions in the company unions themselves as wages, conditions of labour, sickness and accident benefit, pensions, protection of women and child labour, etc., which will actually develop a struggle of the workers against the company.

At the same time, we must link up this whole activity with the struggle against the N.R.A. and its Section 7a, particularly the steel and motor-car codes, and against the Labour Adjustments Act and the still-pending Wagner Labour Disputes Bill, which foster and recognise company unions. With such concrete methods of struggle, the Party and revolutionary unions can not only deal a blow at the growth of company unions, but the struggle against them can be transformed into a weapon for the strengthening of the revolutionary trade union movement, and the development of still greater struggles of the workers against the employers and the Roosevelt government.

## FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF ILLEGAL PARTY WORK IN GERMANY

### Organised Mass Struggle Against Spies and Agents- Provocateurs.

**D**URING the few years preceding Hitler's advent to power, a considerable increase in the membership of the German Communist Party could be observed. The Communist Party cadres\*—especially the lower ones—consisted to a considerable extent of just these newly enrolled members. Although the German Communist Party devoted much attention to educating its cadres and membership, a considerable section of the latter was still insufficiently imbued with the Communist outlook. In spite of this fact, however, and the extremely severe terror of the authorities (even surpassing the tsarist terror after the 1905 revolution in Russia), we have to say that about one-and-a-half years after the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, the percentage of "former Party members" passing over to the enemy's camp is not at all large. Among those who have done so, only a few have betrayed their class brothers to the enemy. Also, before the advent of the fascists to power, they were unsuccessful in getting anything like a large number of agents by false means into the ranks of the German Communist Party for spying and betraying.

After Hitler seized power, the National-Socialists were able to obtain mass denunciation of Communist-inclined persons. This was by both cruel persecution and threats and a well-organised spying apparatus from their own supporters and petty-bourgeois elements. The lower middle-class masses rendered support to the fascist police apparatus. They were what one might call the long arm of the police, whom they were of the opinion should be assisted in repressing the Communists, to give Hitler a chance to carry out his programme.

The agitation and propaganda apparatus of the German Communist Party, courageous in the face of terror and persecutions, and the ever-growing discontent of the masses with the fascist system, restricted the number of denunciations somewhat. The events occurring inside the fascist organisations since June 30th have made the situation still less favourable for denunciations. Not only is the number of denunciations ever decreasing, but even certain sections of the active National-

Socialists and elements in sympathy with them, who previously acted as informers, have now been converted—actively or passively—into a factor which is encouraging revolutionary work.

We have obvious proof of the extent to which the mood of the masses has changed in fascist Germany in the National-Socialist campaign against the "informers' crusade." William Kube, leader of the whole of the Krumark organisation of the German Nazi Party, made the following statement in the *Volkische Beobachter* of July 31:

"On April 18 of this year, the Imperial Minister, Rudolf Hess, declared in public that every citizen (*Volksgenosse*) has the right to lodge a complaint with him in the event of his being honestly convinced that he has cause to point to any defects in, or any mistake on, the part of leading Party comrades or Party organisations. This decree was made use of by professional cranks, of whom there have always been a sufficiency in Germany, in order to organise 'UNBRIDLED CALUMNY OF THE MOST UNWORTHY KIND' against many leaders of the German Nazi Party. The events of June 29th and June 30th were partially used to stage an ABSOLUTELY FOUL campaign of betrayals against national-socialism and its leaders. Every regional leader will confirm with me that since the Roehm putsch\* the number of anonymous letters, spiteful and calumnious attacks, and lying accusations has INCREASED INCREDIBLY. And all the district and local leaders complain of similar facts."

Kube calls these "informers" "low creatures," and states that to scare them, he "sends each denunciation that comes to him to the person whom it concerns, so that he will be able to defend himself against these venomous toads with all the legal means placed at his disposal by the Third Empire." And everybody is aware in advance of how the "legal means" of the Third Empire work. Kube even fixes the extent of punishment for "informers" when he declares that "the behaviour of anonymous informers is nothing short of high treason."

It was not these two factors alone which helped to restrict the number of denunciations of revolutionary workers. The organised struggle of the German Communist Party against spies and agents-provocateurs played a big part in this direction. This struggle did not consist in individual actions, neither did it take place with the help of any definite organ of the German Communist Party. It was carried on day by day by the entire Party as a whole, which mobilised and drew the masses of the workers into the struggle.

And just because the German Communist Party conducted this struggle against spies and agents side by side with the revolutionary workers, it was possible to attain considerable success in this sphere. Moreover, the Communist Party itself,

\* Cadres—from Latin *quadro*: a square, a framework or skeleton of a regiment, etc. Used to denote the most active, experienced and reliable section of the membership, including therefore a large proportion of the party officers. Lower cadres—minor officials, local secretaries, etc.

\* Uprising. See page 759.

having expelled suspicious elements from its ranks and relentlessly fought against them, continually struggled to win ever more confidence among the masses of revolutionary workers.

## II.—The German Communist Party as an Organising Factor.

Comrade Lenin placed a task before the Bolshevik Party of Tsarist Russia of great significance not only in that epoch and the conditions existing then, but meriting the attention of the Communist Parties of capitalist countries to-day as well. Comrade Lenin wrote:

“We must try to create an organisation capable of rendering spies harmless by unmasking and persecuting them. Spies cannot be destroyed. But we can and must create an organisation which exposes spies and educates the working masses for active participation in the struggle against them.” (Vol. V., *Collected Works*, German Edition.)

The way the task is raised speaks in favour of making the struggle against spies not the task of any particular organ, but the task of the whole Communist Party and of the entire working class as a whole. The Communist Party has, first and foremost, to act as an organising factor which guides the struggle against these enemies of the revolutionary proletariat.

The huge apparatus of the fascist rulers of Germany, directed towards suppressing the masses of workers and possessing large cadres of spies, requires that the mass of toilers itself should be brought into the struggle against Hitler's agents who seek to worm their way into the Party and undermine it by espionage and denunciation. Goering himself has received the work of guiding the mighty police apparatus from the hands of the social-democratic ministers. This is well organised for the struggle against the Communists. He has reorganised this apparatus, brought a considerable number of National-Socialists into it, and having combined them with a section of the previous social-democratic police cadres, has formed his own State secret police (so-called “Gestapo”), which, together with the Storm Troops and the Defence Guards, are dealing most cruelly with all suspected of leanings towards Communism. According to information to hand, the State secret police consists of one central management and five sub-sections. The central management is concerned with the general organisation of the police and its auxiliary organs such as, for instance, a strike-breakers' organisation.

The sub-sections are responsible for the following functions:—

- Sub-Section I. Defence of railways and press.  
 “ ” II. Observation of, and measures taken, against the C.P.G., as well as against the revolutionary trade union organisations, and against mass organisations of an

international nature like the German Young Communist League, sports organisations, etc.

- Sub-Section III. Observation of bourgeois parties.  
 “ ” IV. Observation of the National-Socialist movement.  
 “ ” V. Section deals with questions concerning high treason, treachery in the form of divulging military secrets, questions of espionage, the fight against pacifism and questions of national minorities in many.

Besides these sub-sections, there exist still further departments for special questions, as, for example, those concerning emigration, the Jews, foreigners, disintegration work amongst the police themselves, high treason in literature, censoring of postal, telephone and telegraph communications abroad, and with regard to suspicious persons inside the country. This last department is especially well organised, and according to a cautious estimate, no less than 80 per cent. of the post coming in from abroad is carefully checked. We have proof of how far this control goes among the National-Socialists themselves in the events which took place after June 30th in Germany this year. One of the leaders of the Storm Troops who spoke to a leader of the Berlin Storm Troops on the telephone, Ernst, afterwards killed, was convinced afterwards that his conversation was heard and registered by the State secret police on a special wax record.

Several other organs of espionage and provocation, closely connected in their work with the State secret police, were also created; and their aim was to observe and reveal the smallest signs of the Communist movement in the country. Among these organs are the following:

### (a) *Empire Safety Defence Service.*

This organ unites all those defence guards attached to observation of living quarters, in the information service, in the defence detachments, and in the air defence. At his place of living the guard is obliged to present a fortnightly report, on a specially drawn up form, of the state of affairs in connection with the houses which are under his observation. The report must include information about the number of persons living in these houses, any changes liable to occur in this respect, the lodgers living in one or other of the apartments, their occupations, place of work, and the sort of life they lead; whether many visitors come, who these visitors are, etc. The guards are obliged to see whether the lodgers in the houses under their observation participate in the collection of subscriptions, hand out flags, and discover what organisation they belong to (National-Socialist, Imperial Air Defence, or organisations of the National-Socialist unions), their past political convictions, etc. The guards are also obliged to visit persons under their control with a view to becoming personally acquainted with their visitors, and to hand in a corresponding report of the results of these visits.

### (b) *Storm Troops' Communication Service.*

This service has to function first and foremost during mass arrests. All former Communists are, obviously, well known to the guards of the given district, and every communications headquarters of the Storm Troops has to

give a monthly report of the activities and behaviour of these Communists.

(c) *Industrial Police.*

In all the larger undertakings, especially in munition factories, there are strong detachments of industrial police, who are, in the main, taken from the former workshop police. For instance, at the Siemens works in Berlin, there is a detachment of approximately 200 persons; and at the I.G. Farbenwerke chemical works a detachment of over 3,000 men, distributed throughout the separate workshops. Some of these police wear the uniform of the former workshop police; but in the majority of cases they are used as workers and office employees directly connected with the productive process. These police agents not only go through a careful military training, but are trained politically as well, so that side by side with the execution of their police duties, they have an opportunity of developing into good "workers" and "industrialists." At the munition factories, moreover, there are also agents of the intelligence defence department of the Reichswehr. The number of these to be found in each individual undertaking is decided by the degree of importance of the latter. Employees in hotels and cafés—especially in large undertakings of this kind—are periodically given written or oral instructions as to how and whom they should keep under observation. Moreover, posters are hung in large numbers in the dressing-rooms of the café and hotel employees, bearing the inscription: "Make a note of the conversation of all visitors and pass it on to the right quarters."

Yet another espionage organisation meriting attention is the Nazi workshop organisation. The Nazi workshop organisation has special departments to control the leadership and organisation of espionage.

This short review of the police and intelligence apparatus of Germany clearly shows the enormous efforts being made by the fascist government to crush the Communist Party and the revolutionary working class of Germany. This review shows also that the German Communist Party must build up and defend its own organisation to ensure that it will be capable of fighting at all times and its influence will increase daily. One of the most important factors in this direction is that the Party should see to it that it keeps its ranks clear of Hitler agents. Of course, it is not possible to avoid the penetration of spies and agents-provocateurs into the Party entirely. So long as the class struggle continues between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the latter will inevitably strive to get spies and agents-provocateurs into the Communist Party by false means. But the whole question is to reduce the number and the influence of these elements to a minimum. Because the Communist Party is the only Party in Germany that has always, and is still, waging an unswerving struggle against these wreckers, it had only a few spies and provocateurs in its ranks in comparison with its size at the moment of the establishment of fascist dictatorship in Germany, and they were unable, therefore, to do the Party much harm, even in illegal conditions. The fact that all newly recruited members were tested on entering the Party, and a careful purging of the Party itself was made,

played a big part in the struggle against police agents penetrating into the Party. The experiences acquired by the German Communist Party during its illegal existence have shown that still not all the Party organisations manifest sufficient vigilance and wisdom in enrolling members. Actual practice has shown that traitors and deserters have feathered their nests chiefly from the demoralised strata of the unemployed and petty-bourgeois elements. Where there is a more considerable recruiting of workers from the bench into the Party, the number of spies, traitors and deserters would be considerably less still. Workers from the bench can easily be proved trustworthy by the Party and the whole working class. As for other sections of the population, it is far more difficult to establish their past and manner of conducting their lives. But actual practice shows that constant control of every member of the Party both before and after he is admitted is necessary. By means of verifying, controlling, observing and collecting information concerning every Party member, it is possible to follow the activities of spies, agents-provocateurs, deceivers, and others, and unmask them. The struggle against these wreckers inside the Party itself should be organised by the central leadership of the Party, and cover each organisational unit, even the very smallest. Regular instructions should be given to the membership on this by forming special literature courses, etc. Party workers and those working in the mass organisations should be informed as to which of the members turned out to be wreckers. The German Communist Party can boast of considerable success in this direction both during its legal existence and also since it has been illegal.

Beginning with 1919 right up to the present time, the Party has been publishing, and still publishes regularly, special almanacks of spies and so-called black lists. These almanacks are issued in about one-two thousand copies, and the black lists, which come out once or twice monthly, are printed in considerably larger numbers. These lists are published both by the central leading apparatus of the German Communist Party as well as by its district organisations. We have proof of the extent to which this method has rendered spies harmless in the black lists issued during 1929-1931. Side by side with innumerable impostors, charlatans, and minor cases of espionage, about 150 important cases of spies and agents-provocateurs discovered were also published.

There are many in the German Communist Party who have been and are still in favour of "not making a fuss when expelling spies from Party organisations, so as not to knock the desire out of the honest worker to join an organisation

in whose ranks spies are to be found." The Communist Party of Germany has always fought and will continue to fight inside the Party against this mistaken point of view. The Communist Party is of the opinion that not only should the presence of spies and agents-provocateurs in the ranks of the Party not be hushed up, but that the revolutionary working masses should be drawn into the struggle against these police elements, that the masses should be roused up against them, to instil fear into them. The honest worker and former social-democrats who are afraid to join the Communist Party because of the danger of espionage should have it explained to them that the German Communist Party is the only Party in the country which carried on a relentless struggle against these elements. The Social-Democratic Party has been unable to carry on a struggle of this kind, because its leaders, police ministers, have strengthened and extended the police apparatus. They have thus nurtured these spies and agents-provocateurs themselves, against whom the German Communist Party is fighting unwaveringly.

#### **Bringing the Masses Into the Struggle.**

The German Communist Party has achieved considerable success, both during its legal period and illegal existence, in the work of drawing the masses of workers into the struggle against spies and agents-provocateurs. It was able to popularise the struggle against these elements through the press, literature and in public speeches, in which it branded these wreckers. Here are a few examples from the illegal period, which characterise the methods used in mobilising the workers. The authorities have built up a strong network of espionage in several munition factories. All the workers who were suspected of being partial to Communism in any way were kept under strict observation and subject to dismissal. The spying cadres in these undertakings were not permanent, but changed and removed from one workshop to another as need arose, carrying on their work there. Thanks to well arranged connections and careful watching, a considerable section of the spies was discovered. The corresponding workshop newspaper published by our organisation saw to it that the workers on the staff not only of the main works but also of all the other kindred enterprises, were informed as to whom they should beware of and against whom they should fight.

In X— the photographs of three spies were obtained. They were printed on postcards and distributed in large numbers among the population with the inscription: "TAKE A LOOK AT THESE SCOUNDRELS AND DEAL WITH THEM EVERYWHERE AS THEY DESERVE."

The following two examples show the good results forthcoming WHEN THE MASSES TAKE PART in the struggle against spies and agents-provocateurs:

In Y— an arrested "Communist" went over to the side of the class enemy under the influence of torture. He betrayed several revolutionary workers, among whom there was also a worker in one of the mass organisations. As a result the latter was killed by the guards. When the Party learned of this treachery it—

(1) issued a newspaper at the place where the traitor lived, containing his photograph and an article about him;

(2) issued a circular letter to those lodging in his house;

(3) posted up inscriptions in streets adjacent to the district, containing slogans against traitors;

(4) prepared and posted up notices giving the traitor's distinctive marks.

As a result of these measures, we had the following:

(1) The traitor was turned out of his apartment in consequence of the protest of the other lodgers in the house;

(2) because of this circumstance, and especially thanks to the attitude of the working masses of the district to him, he was compelled to leave the district entirely;

(3) the traitor dared not bring about further arrests of workers by informing against them, although he knew many of them.

The following is an example of who may be drawn into the struggle against spies and agent-provocateurs:

In Z— there was a spy who went about the district for a long time and betrayed the workers. When he turned up in Z— once more, the comrades organised detachments of children who used to cry after him when they met him on the streets with shouts of: "Judas heart. Wretch!" etc.

The spy, boycotted on all sides and being unable to show himself in the streets for fear of the universal hostility shown towards him, was compelled to leave that locality.

The above examples show the varied methods of mass struggle against spies and agents-provocateurs which can be used. Here is yet another example in addition to the methods of mass struggle indicated above. This example, taken from life in a factory, shows how the Party organisation can mobilise the workers on the staff to fight against spies and agent-provocateurs.

In consequence of a mass boycott, which is very often adopted, not only is the work of a spy in a given establishment made unproductive, but he himself has to leave the field of action voluntarily, because he loses his self-confidence.

At a certain factory... a dispute arose between a Communist and a National-Socialist, during which the Communist openly stated his opinion concerning the "leaders" of the Third Empire. As a result, the National-Socialist informed against the Communist, who, in consequence, was dismissed from the works and arrested. The remaining Communists mobilised the workers of the department in which the National-Socialist was working. The workers stole his tools, let his material fall by "accident," making him responsible for bad work, etc. A few days later the National-Socialist went to the police and declared that the information he had given about his com-

rade was not true and that his motive was personal revenge. The Communist was soon released from confinement and is now working in the same factory as before.

In connection with the sharpening of the struggle of the working class against fascist dictatorship and the approach of a determined struggle for power, increased vigilance of Party organisations is essential, and the working masses must be drawn into the struggle on a wider scale.

Th actual practice of the mass struggle against spies and agent-provocateurs has shown that, des-

pite the fine achievements of which the German Communist Party may boast, it is even more essential than ever before to bring the masses into the struggle and to raise the struggle itself on to a higher level. Thanks to the work it has done, the Communist Party of Germany is increasingly winning the confidence of the masses. The masses are affording more and more support to the work of the Communists. They will give them assistance even on this most important section of the revolutionary front, if the German Communist Party organises its work sufficiently well.

## A BOOK ON SOVIET CHINA

*The Fundamental Laws of the Chinese Soviet Republic. Preface by Bela Kun. London, 1934.*

*Reviewed by L.M.*

**M**ARTIN LAWRENCE, of London, have published a small book prefaced by Bela Kun on the fundamental laws of the Chinese Soviet Republic. The most important laws, decrees and decisions of the Soviet power in China are carefully assembled in this book. The book quotes the constitution of the Chinese Soviet Republic and its agrarian legislature in full, including the land laws and the law regarding the distribution of land. Next follows a section on the Red Army. This includes the resolution of the All-Chinese Congress of Soviets regarding the Red Army, decree No. 9, and the rules relating to the allowances and privileges granted to the fighters of the Chinese workers' and peasants' Red Army. The labour code and the inspection of its application, the laws, resolutions and decrees on economic policy, industry and trade, on the organisation and activity of the co-operatives, and also regarding loans, occupy the larger part of the book. Legis-

lation regarding the national minorities and relating to the family and marriage abolishes the absence of rights and the oppression of the national minorities and the toiling women.

Maps of Soviet China and a number of interesting diagrams are appended to the book. A study of these laws and decrees provides the reader with a general idea of the trend of the activity of the Soviet power in China and of the realisation of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. The preface, written by Comrade Bela Kun, explains the nature and the content of the Soviet Revolution in China, gives a brief sketch of its development and its enormous international political importance. The book will be extremely useful in the study of the problems of the bourgeois-democratic, anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in China, by the workers and toilers of the Anglo-Saxon countries. This book deserves wide distribution and study.

---

*(Continued from page 759.)*

the "carpers," the "saboteurs," the "wreckers" and the "cavillers." Goebbels must now furnish "grounds" for the shooting of Roehm, Ernst and his other closest friends. He must now cover the storm troopers' detachments with mud. He is now compelled to wage a struggle against all those

slogans which he himself launched among the masses. This is the reason why failure attends the agitational activity of Goebbels. And why the German bourgeoisie will pay dearly for the social-demagogy, which created the mass basis of fascism in the years gone by.

## "A SLY, COWARDLY, SPINELESS AND CHARACTERLESS RAT"

BOOK REVIEW BY L. MADYAR.

GOEBBELS, Minister of National Education and Propaganda in the "Third Empire," has now published his third book on the heroic feats of National-Socialism in general—and those of Goebbels himself, in particular.\* This book of Goebbels' appears to be his diary, covering the events occurring in Germany from January 1, 1932, to May 1, 1933. The short separate entries made by Goebbels do not here impress as having been actually written in the heat of the events. It rather appears that this diary was written at some later date. Goebbels "foresees" the turns of events too well, he "foretells" developments and gives various people characteristics, which were only justified at a later date. Be that as it may, these separate entries of Goebbels relate to the most tempestuous period of the development of the fascist movement in Germany, when National-Socialism won its many-millioned mass basis, the period of the fight of the National-Socialists for power. Bearing this in mind, Goebbels' book is disappointing—from many points of view. Nothing new can be found in his book about the most important facts, and events, let alone the main-springs of events and their driving forces. It may even be said that Goebbels is quite reserved in speaking of what has gone on behind the scenes. He does not show the National-Socialist Party in action, nor does he describe its mechanism, or organisation. Even the methods of agitation and propaganda practised by National-Socialists are not brought out clearly. The most one can find in Goebbels' book is about Goebbels himself, his work, and his heroic deeds; his warm and close relations with Hitler, and other National-Socialist leaders.

\* \* \*

There can be no doubt that German national-socialism has provided the most striking example of the national and social demagogy of fascism; showing how the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses can be rallied by fascist slogans in the interests of the terrorist dictatorship of finance capital. German national-socialism made the attempt to win over the masses of workers, to attract the working and peasant youth, who had not passed through the hell of the imperialist war, nor the great school of the class struggle, to their side. So long as German national-socialism was in opposition, making its way to power, it showed

how to use mass psychology, kindle chauvinist\* passions, anti-Semitism, and unbridled social demagogy.† Examples of mass agitation and propaganda and mass stupefaction, similar to that practised by German fascism of the National-Socialist brand, were to be found only during the world imperialist war, and even then only in certain capitalist countries.

Present-day capitalism has evolved a complete "science," that of advertising. The most acute competition, in conditions where the sale of goods encounters tremendous difficulties, forces the capitalists to resort to the most gross and elaborate methods of advertisement to win the purchaser. In U.S.A., Germany, Japan, Great Britain, etc., advertising has become a profession, employing many thousands of people. During the prosperity period in the United States, advertising expenses absorbed hundreds of millions of dollars; about 500 million dollars per annum. The struggle against competitors, the fight for the customer's dollar, compel the manufacturer to make use of every possible method of influencing the masses by advertising; such as the press, posters, leaflets, canvassers, broadcasting, theatres, bourgeois poetry and art, light effects, aeroplane stunts, "gift" schemes, etc. Everything is used to ensure the sale of the goods. The object of advertising is to inculcate into the minds of the customers the advertising slogan of the given firm, firm's name and trade mark; to suggest to the customer that the goods of this particular firm are of a particularly high quality. At the same time, the advertisement continuously repeats itself, and is naturally not afraid of uttering commonplaces to make much noise. These methods of commercial advertising are increasingly percolating the political life of bourgeois countries. The presidential elections in the United States, for example, represent a gigantic competition between the old political parties in the field of advertising agitation. In actual fact, the agitation and propaganda of the National-Socialists were reared in the same school. Essentially, these were the very methods of mass agitation and propaganda developed by German fascism. The most artful, brazen, most aggressive and noisy representative of these methods of mass agitation is "Dr." Goebbels.

\**Chauvinism*: from Nicolas Chauvin. A fanatical adherent of Napoleon. Super-rabid Nationalism of an aggressive nature.

†*Demagogy*: an unprincipled appeal to passions and prejudices.

\* *Vom Kaiserhof zum Reichskanzel!* By Dr. Joseph Goebbels (Berlin, 1934).

**All Things To All Men!**

The outstanding feature of the agitational and propagandist methods practised by the German National-Socialists, and by Goebbels in the first place, is the unlimited cynicism of their attitude to the masses. The chief method practised by the National-Socialists in the sphere of social demagoguery was to promise everything to everybody; to promise everybody what interested him most. They quite shamelessly promised the unemployed employment, and higher wages to the employed workers; at the same time promising the employers that social legislation would be cut down, that expenditure on the social services would be lowered, that wages would be reduced. Without the slightest embarrassment they promised high tariffs and high prices to the peasants, and simultaneously gave the urban consumers the impression that they would reduce their cost of living. They made speeches in Dusseldorf and Hamburg before the representatives of the heavy and exporting industries, in an endeavour to gain their support, while at the same time they promised the artisan, the small tradesmen, the worker and the peasant to keep the trusts in check.

In his book, Goebbels sings long hymns of praise to Schacht, the representative of the largest German banks, while promising the German petty-bourgeois and the peasantry, at the same time, who are up to the ears in debt, that their interest bondage would be abolished. It is a well-known fact that the National-Socialists have held two meetings in one and the same street in Berlin on one and the same evening, though in two different places. At one meeting, attended by landlords, promises were made that rents would be raised. At the other meeting, convened for tenants in a building nearby, the latter were promised that their rents would be reduced. Devoid of embarrassment or shame, they promised good, well-paid jobs to government officials; soothing the taxpayers at the same time with the promise that state expenses would be reduced and the salaries of officials cut.

Alongside social demagoguery of the lowest order, they excited chauvinism and anti-Semitism, inculcating their audiences with their notorious "race theory." And since political advertisement must prove that the goods offered are better than all other goods, they made the principle of the leader the basis of their policy, inspiring the masses with the idea that the best goods on the political exchange—the best leader is Hitler.

They appealed to the property instincts of the petty bourgeoisie of the town and countryside. They deliberately ignored the differences between social-democracy and Communism, declaring that social-democracy was also a "Marxist" party. They

appealed to the petty-bourgeois strata who had been flung out of their rut and against parliamentarism, against the old parliamentary parties. At the same time National-Socialism was not afraid of repeating itself, did not mind banalities, common-places, or loud noise. Goebbels himself emphasises that when agitating you must appeal to the "most primitive instincts of the masses" and sense their moods, their complaints, their wrongs, dreams and hopes.

And since the petty-bourgeois, who stands between the two fundamental classes of modern society, namely, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, considers himself above classes, they hammered away at the petty-bourgeois fear of the class struggle; proclaiming national unity and liquidation of the class struggle as the supreme principle of their policy. As the bourgeoisie, and particularly the petty-bourgeoisie, dream of eternal categories, they aimed at the urge of the petty bourgeois for such "eternal" categories, as "the people," "honour," "fidelity," "courage," "heroism," "love for one's country," and without shame or reserve, raised the most trite, hackneyed, and banal "eternal truths," the eternal slogans of the petty-bourgeois, so long refuted by life and the class struggle.

Goebbels himself is of petty-bourgeois origin. He belongs to that category of whom Bismarck in his time declared they become politicians, for otherwise they could find no normal career. Goebbels took part in the National-Socialist movement, which declared itself to be a militant movement of the participants of the past and future fronts of the imperialist and civil wars. He joined a movement, which used terror and violence against the proletariat, terror and violence against Marxism, as its leading method. But Goebbels personally was never at the front, he does not know the taste of gunpowder, and always felt his inner weakness and cowardice when among the professionals of the imperialist and civil war. Goebbels took part in a movement, which proclaimed the northern, powerful Aryan race to be the supreme race. But he himself is a physical monster,\* weak and of low stature, and obviously secretly ashamed of his physical defects. He has a passionate desire for power, but at the same time is essentially filled with reverence for those who wielded power in the old pre-war Germany.

**Intriguer and Traitor.**

He is a man of agitational phrases, of outward enthusiasm, but at the same time he sees the political thieves'-kitchen of the bourgeois parties, and especially all the degrading intrigues inside his own party, and he becomes a cynic. He is a mass

\* "Dr." Goebbels is a syphilitic dwarf with a large club-foot.—Ed.

worker in his official capacity, and by his position in the party, but at the same time he despises the masses and repeatedly emphasises that he has not the slightest intention of appealing to their mental capacity and qualities. In his own party, in his own movement, he is surrounded by people of no great education or ability. Apparently he has not a very high appraisal of the mental capacity of the "leader" himself—of Hitler. Hitler's ideas about women, about the noble estate, and about his own tasks and place in Germany, so often quoted by Goebbels in his book, are so trite, so absurd, that despite all the praises lavished by Goebbels in honour of his leader, they sound more like mockery. Thus Goebbels himself becomes a cynic towards his own party comrades and probably to himself. It is precisely his cynicism, precisely his feeling of his own inward weakness, the sense of his own infirmity, both physical and ideological, plus an over-ripe morbid ambition, that develop his hatred of his nearest party comrades, and his capacities for the basest intrigues in him. These are multiplied by animal fear of the revolutionary proletariat, lust for vengeance, and desire to give a lesson to the Communists. He himself exposes these qualities of his, when he uses his diary, beforehand, long before the seizure of power, to gloat over his future ministerial position on one hand, and the idea of dealing with his political and class adversaries on the other.

Alongside Hitler, Goebbels was the most outstanding agitator and organiser in the National-Socialist party. As a journalist he never was, nor is, anything special. He himself repeatedly emphasised that whereas the National-Socialists succeeded in training and rallying around themselves a group of fairly good agitators, orators and organisers, their party press is below criticism. And both before the seizure of power, and afterwards, the National-Socialist press was (and still remains) extremely tedious and unattractive. In the hands of the National-Socialists the press never served as an important weapon in the seizure of power. Before their advent to power, it was impossible to wage the contradictory kind of propaganda which they developed at their meetings in the press. Thus, Goebbels is primarily an orator, an agitator and an organiser of propaganda, a mass worker in the National-Socialist movement. This is evidently the reason why he apparently occupied a position on the "left flank" of the Nazis. Goebbels was a "left" National-Socialist, because he recognised no bounds in the sphere of social-demagogy. Thus, this political coward and intriguer defended the dominion of monopoly capital.

In the phrases he used and the demagogy he employed he stood chock-a-block with Standis and

Otto Strasser, who raised a mutiny against Hitler. When he saw that the mutiny raised by Standis remained isolated, however, he betrayed Standis immediately without the slightest compunction, and helped to liquidate it.

He was the closest friend of Helldorf, the former leader of the Berlin storm troopers, but he betrayed him, just as quickly and calmly, when the latter was driven out of Berlin.

Goebbels was the prophet of the second National-Socialist revolution. But when, at the order of monopolist capital, Hitler proclaimed the national revolution to be at an end, and the second revolution to be a crime, Goebbels turned against the second revolution without any shame or embarrassment.

He was the closest friend and companion-in-arms of Roehm, Heines, Ernst and the other storm troop leaders who were shot by Hitler on June 30. As a matter of fact, it was he who supplied these people with the slogan of the struggle "against reaction," it was precisely *he* who furnished them with the idea of the non-completion of the National-Socialist revolution and the necessity of bringing it about. But when Hitler, at the order of the Junkers, capitalists and the Reichswehr generals, massacred his nearest party comrades, companions-in-arms and friends, Goebbels was present at this operation, and did his utmost to spatter his murdered friends with mud.

From this point of view Goebbels is probably sorry at having prematurely published his book, for he dealt out very much praise to Roehm in it. He sings long hymns of praise to Roehm. He writes:

"Chief of Staff Roehm accomplished a miracle in creating a firm and indestructible organisation out of scattered and disorganised groups." (Page 43.)

He praises the diplomatic abilities of Roehm: "Our representatives, headed by Roehm, the Chief of Staff quarters accomplished their task brilliantly."

This is what he writes about the rôle of Roehm in the negotiations with Schleicher:

"Chief of Staff Roehm can always find a way out of any position."

And further:

"The Chief of the Staff is remarkable for his wonderful freshness and imperturbable composure. In all his negotiations he is distinguished by his foresight, wisdom, firmness and courageous ability for action."

Now, of course, Goebbels has to disclaim these praises, and in so far as he announced in his book that the attribution of homo-sexualist tendencies to Roehm was a base slander of the Marxists, he must now introduce certain corrections, for both Hitler and Goebbels testified to the whole world that Roehm was a homo-sexualist, a libertine, etc.

### The "Unity" of the National-Socialist Party.

There is nothing new in this world. It is difficult to repress a smile as we read now in Goebbels' book, that

"our way to power is the great song of fidelity, such as has rarely been manifested in the history of humanity," as we recall the events of June 30th, when the true friends murdered each other in strict accordance with all the rules of the gangsters' art. There is nothing permanent in this world! When we read to-day in Goebbels' book that:

"No one should imagine that among the people who stand around Hitler there have ever been any quarrels or conflicts, or that such can ever happen among them in the future,"

we have to laugh and point out that certain "quarrels," and even "conflicts," which went as far as murders and executions, did take place "among the people who stand around Hitler."

Goebbels' phrase that

"we gained power together, and we will make use of this power!"

sounds exceptionally funny to-day, after the shootings of June 30. And how incredibly funny to-day is the sound of Goebbels' pæans of praise to the storm-troopers and their leaders, their heroic deeds, unsurpassed courage and gigantic merits before the country and the people!

Yes, Goebbels will find all this quite unpleasant at present. Yes, Goebbels may yet suffer for the premature publication of his book. He was a coward, a cynic and a traitor at every turn in the life of the National-Socialist Party. He always put his stake on the winner. But it seems that even such a sly, cowardly, spineless and characterless rat as Goebbels, may back a wrong horse. He may get away with his eulogy of Goering, at least for the time being. Goering is still in power. It is quite a matter of course that he praises Hitler. But he also indulged in praise of Roehm, Helldorf and Heines, who were among those shot on June 30. He praised them as wise, brave, firm, courageous Aryans, and later as Minister of Propaganda was to proclaim them traitors, embezzlers and libertines. It was only in respect to G. Strasser that his sense did not betray him. He hit the nail on the head regarding Strasser when he proclaimed the latter a defeatist, a pessimist, who failed in his loyalty to the party and to its leader; a careerist, an intriguer, a traitor, and a scoundrel. He was evidently preparing the way to the shooting of Strasser. He hit the nail on the head in this respect.

\* \* \*

Comparatively little can be found in Goebbels' book about the mechanism of National-Socialist propaganda and agitation, and about the methods used to wage the various election campaigns. We see Goebbels searching all the time for new methods of agitation and propaganda. We see

him looking for methods of applying all the means of modern technique in the sphere of mass agitation; meetings, assemblies, demonstrations, parades, films, the press, the theatres, broadcasting, posters, leaflets, everything is made use of so as to rally the masses, to stimulate them, to excite and enhance the mass psychology.

But all this costs money, and tremendous supplies of money, all the more since in its mass work National-Socialism makes use of cars, aeroplanes, and all other modern transportation facilities. Money, money—this question runs throughout the whole of Goebbels' diary like a red thread. The National-Socialist Party suffers from financial difficulties, all the time, but in some peculiar way these difficulties are always solved, and at the most critical moments money is supplied from somewhere, and by someone. But Goebbels is extremely modest and reserved, and does not mention whence and from whom the money is obtained. At the same time it appears that when the National-Socialists came to power and were engaged in the Reichstag elections, their party even "made a profit" on the election campaign, and its income proved to be higher than its expenditure. But Goebbels fails to explain this miracle. The lack of money prior to the advent to power—such is one of the major complaints made by Goebbels.

Another complaint of his refers to the struggle inside the National-Socialist Party. He blabs out all the time that every personal question, every candidature for the Reichstag, or to the Landtags, every position in the party apparatus furnished the pretext for the most abominable personal squabbles.

When Goebbels wrote and published his book, he evidently wanted to build a monument, of a kind, to the heroic feats and the struggle of the National-Socialist Party. But when you read his book with close attention, you find rather an exposure of the National-Socialist Party. Goebbels himself exposes his party, relating how it carried on its most base and obscure intrigues through the medium of persons of the worst repute, handled all kinds of underhand deals and transactions, how the representatives of the party wormed their way to the Junkers, into the "Nobles' Club." He shows how Hitler brewed his plots together with Schleicher and Papen against the Bruning government, then with Schleicher against the Papen government, then later with Papen against the Schleicher government, and finally against Hugenberg as well. Petty, filthy, underhand intrigues! But at the same time the leaders of National-Socialism appear before the masses as heroes and fighters against the reaction of these very same Papens, Schleichers and Hugenbergs.

Goebbels exposes the inner weakness and the

tremendous vacillations of the National-Socialist Party. He relates himself how in every crisis, at the least little failure, depression, passivity and defeatist moods set in immediately in the party. Thus, after August 13, when Hindenburg refused to appoint Hitler as Chancellor, an incredible panic, disorganisation and defeatism reigned in the party. Similarly, after the November election, when the National-Socialist Party lost two million votes, it was again the scene of depressed defeatist moods, passivity and desertion. Further, even Standis' speech aroused panic and crisis in the Party. All the more when Gregor Strasser resigned all his posts in the National-Socialist Party, and proceeded to negotiate with Schleicher about joining the Government, did the panic, commotion and depression among the upper circles of the National-Socialist Party assume immense proportions, even according to the description given by Goebbels. One reads these sections of Goebbels' diary with unflinching interest. They illustrate the path of National-Socialism in the future. The motley social composition of the party, the considerable stratum of petty bourgeois elements, as well as the personal qualities (mood) of the "leader" himself condition the unstable structure of the party, and disclose the relatively very weak power of resistance of this party during periods of sharp turns and crises. Goebbels makes an attempt to depict Hitler as a calm, firm, steady and resolute man. But it is evident from these very characteristics given by Goebbels, that the "leader" enjoys these qualities in very small doses, that the "leader" himself vacillates, is unable to make a quick decision, and when it comes to a crisis, he makes decisions in a state of hysterics.

\* \* \*

#### The Workers.

Goebbels has little to say for the workers and about the workers. He tells, of course, with a certain bragging, about the workers who were present at the National-Socialist meetings and who joined the storm-troopers' detachments. But Goebbels is about as much interested in the difficult and bitter life of the unemployed as he is interested in the life of the peasant. But at the same time Goebbels is afraid of the workers, he is afraid of the working class movement. When partial strikes broke out during the period of the Papen government, he declared with fright that the government was helpless against the strikes, that the trade unions were beginning to be drawn into the struggle, and that matters were proving to be more dangerous than many of them imagined. When the transport workers' strike broke out in Berlin, Goebbels, who supported this

strike by word of mouth, entered the following correct sentence in his diary:

"A general strike is a terrible weapon. Machine-guns and bayonets can do nothing against a general strike." And on July 20, when Papen accomplished his putsch\* in Prussia, after driving off the social-democratic government, Goebbels wrote in his diary with a sigh of relief:

"The general strike did not take place. Rumours are about that the Reichsbanner arranged a mutiny, but these are children's fairy-tales. The Reds have missed their decisive hour."

And when the social-democratic workers read Goebbels' book, they will certainly note that even such a base and abominable enemy of the working class as this bloodthirsty and sadistic runt, Goebbels, can speak with fake indignation about the trade unions having disrupted the strike of the Berlin transport workers. They will notice how even Goebbels emphasises that the social-democratic party failed to show any resistance in Prussia, that after Hitler's advent to power many high replaced functionaries—social-democrats—used to visit Goering begging him to give them an allowance for removal.

Goebbels was doubtlessly the most active and gifted agitator of the National-Socialist movement. He has certain achievements. But they prove that Goebbels was a good agitator and propagandist, only as long as he was in the opposition.

As soon as his party came to power, and he himself a Minister, nothing went right with him. He became a poor agitator, orator and propagandist.

One failure follows another. He created a gigantic apparatus. He concentrated the whole of the press, all the theatres, cinemas and radio in his hands. He spends millions on propaganda. He maintains a staff of agitators and propagandists, many thousands strong, and despite all this, national-socialism is ever more and more losing its mass basis!

Goebbels used to believe, once, in the omnipotence of agitation and propaganda.

But now fascism is in power. Shrieking contradictions between words and deeds, between the promises and the actual policy of National-Socialism are now becoming clear to the masses, and no agitation or propaganda can destroy these contradictions. No agitation or propaganda are in a position to wipe out of the consciousness of the masses, the fact that the National-Socialists came to power lavishing promises upon each and all, promising everyone what interested them most, and when in power, promoting the dictatorship of Krupp and Thyssen. Goebbels is now compelled to wage a struggle against the "critics,"

(Continued on page 754.)

\* *Putsch*: an uprising of a group or sect without the participation of masses.

**INTERNATIONAL NEWS FOR  
THE INTERNATIONALIST**

**News from Russia**

**News from China**

**News from Germany**

**World-wide News, detailed and  
authentic, appears in the**

**DAILY  
WORKER**

**EVERY DAY**

**PUBLISHED BY MODERN BOOKS, LTD., 46 THEOBALD'S ROAD, LONDON, W.C.1, AND  
PRINTED BY BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., SMITH-DORRIEN ROAD, LEICESTER, ENGLAND.**