

THE

WORKERS OF THE WORLD - UNITE!



Communist

THE PROGRAMME OF THE BRITISH UNION
OF FASCISTS. By R. McIlhone

THE ZINOVIEV OPPOSITION AND ITS
COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY SCUM

By B. Ponomarov

Etc., Etc.

International

VOLUME XII

2

JANUARY 20th, 1935

THREEPENCE

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 2

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

	Page
1. From Acts of Treason to the Party — To the Fascist White-Guard Shot !	51
2. A Year of Great Advances.	59
3. The Situation in Czecho-Slovakia and the Tasks of the United Front. K. Gottwald.	64
4. The Social and Economic Programme of the British Union of Fascists. By R. McIlhone.	73

MATERIAL FOR PROPAGANDISTS.

5. The Zinoviev Opposition and its Counter-Revolutionary Scum. By B. Ponomarov.	83
--	----

FROM ACTS OF TREASON TO THE PARTY — TO THE FASCIST WHITE-GUARD SHOT!

WHEN the shot was fired in Leningrad and the leader of the Leningrad workers, the fiery tribune of the revolution, friend and companion-in-arms of the great Stalin — Sergei Mironovich Kirov fell, laid low by a bullet, the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. and the revolutionary workers of the whole world realised one thing clearly. The shot was fired by a class enemy of the proletariat, a lackey of the fascist bourgeoisie and an agent of international imperialism.

But when further investigations disclosed the whole truth, then proletarian indignation, contempt and hatred knew no bounds. Sergei Mironovich Kirov was assassinated by despicable renegades, traitors and Judases — by members of the former anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, who had joined hands with those in the camp of the bloody fascists and white-guards, and adopted fascist methods of struggle against the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

The investigation established that “despite the capitulation of the former anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, the underground work of the most active members of that bloc did not cease but continued until very recently”

(indictment of Nikolayev and others). The contemptible leaders of the group — Zinoviev, Kamenev and others, as well as of Zinoviev, Yevdokimov, etc. — capitulated to the Party times without number in words, wrote declarations about renouncing their views and their fractional struggle, beat their breasts and publicly repented for their innumerable crimes against the proletariat. Our mighty Party did not call their past errors to mind without necessity, and even their treachery and perfidy after they had repudiated it (though the Party never forgot). The mighty Party of a mighty class, a class that has come to power and is victoriously building socialism, routing out the remnants of abominable capitalist relations in economy and the consciousness of the man, this Party treated these people with leniency. But they, the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, under the guise of agreeing with the Party and its leadership, continued their surreptitious underground work of vile betrayal of the cause of socialist construction and the world proletarian revolution. These dishonest and bankrupt politicians, these capitulators and deserters from the front of the class struggle, poisoned everything they touched with their secret snakelike malice against the Party, its Leninist leadership and brilliant leader, Comrade Stalin. They it was who nurtured the

despicable murderers, the “Leningrad Centre.” It was they who educated these youths over a number of years, inculcating a lack of faith in the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. into them! They taught them to shut their eyes to the magnificent victories being achieved by socialism, and gloat over the difficulties arising from time to time in the path of the struggle of the proletariat. It is they—this vile Zinoviev group of ambitious shady politicians, offended lords, and contemptible cowards and traitors — as investigations have established, who knew of the terroristic sentiments of the members of the “Leningrad Centre” which they inflamed. Consequently they bear not only moral responsibility before the world proletariat and Communism for the assassination of Sergei Mironovich Kirov, but also responsibility according to Soviet law.

Although not the actual murderers, it was they who incited their Leningrad adherents on to this ignominious deed by spreading hatred of the leadership of the Party. They corrupted them and brought about their political degeneration, urging them to terror against the leaders of the Party and the Soviet State. “Sentiments of a terrorist character could not fail to grow in this heated atmosphere of hatred for the leadership of the C.P.S.U. . .” admitted the recently executed Rumyantsev, member of the “Leningrad Centre,” pupil of Zinoviev, Kamenev and others.

Yevdokimov, a member of the Moscow “Zinoviev Centre,” made the following declaration in the Soviet Supreme Court (published *Pravda*, January 16th):—

“When the charge is laid against us of harbouring terrorist sentiments, then I firmly declare: Yes, we must bear the responsibility for this, for the poison with which for a decade we infected those who surrounded us, contributed to the perpetration of this crime, namely, the assassination of Kirov.”

G. Zinoviev was also obliged to recognise at least his moral and political responsibility for the crime and declared that

“the Party is absolutely correct in what it says regarding the political responsibility of the former anti-Party ‘Zinoviev’ group for the murder committed”

As regards those who directly organised the murder (indictment of Zinoviev, Yevdokimov, Geortik, etc.), the Military Tribunal of the High Court, at its session on January 15th and 16th, established the fact of the existence of a counter-revolutionary group in Moscow, headed by the so-called “Moscow Centre,” of which Zinoviev,

Yevdokimov, Bakayev, etc., were members, and under whose leadership the counter-revolutionary Leningrad group carried on its operations.

The proletarian court has passed sentence on these traitors. The masses of the people of the U.S.S.R. have fully endorsed the sentence passed.

The investigation established that the actual perpetrator of the crime, L. Nikolayev, committed his villainous deed "on the instruction of the terrorist 'Leningrad Centre,'" formed of members of the former Zinoviev anti-Soviet group in Leningrad. The aim of this counter revolutionary terrorist group was to "disorganise the leadership of the Soviet government by acts of terror, directed against the leaders of the Soviet government, by this means to change the present policy in the spirit of the so-called Zinoviev-Trotskyist platform."

The investigation also revealed that "having lost all hopes of receiving the support of the masses, and being a closed and politically doomed anti-Soviet group," the members of that group "not only turned to the path of direct terror," but "placed their stakes upon help 'from abroad' — upon armed intervention and assistance from certain foreign powers." For this purpose the members of the Leningrad terrorist centre of the Zinovievites established contact through Nikolayev with the consul in Leningrad, a former social-democrat, by the way, who has since been recalled to his country. From him they received financial aid in return for which they promised to supply the consulate with "materials of an anti-Soviet character regarding the internal situation in the Soviet Union" (testimony of Nikolayev).

In his turn the . . . consul promised to establish contact between the "Leningrad Centre" of the Zinovievites and the counter-revolutionary Trotsky. This consulate, according to press reports, was that of a small country, not in a position to prepare war independently against such a mighty and powerful country as the U.S.S.R. The situation becomes clear if (as we have every right to do) we presume that back of this small state stands another, big and powerful. This is one which considers it its "holy mission" to wage war against the U.S.S.R. and is preparing to alter the frontiers in Europe by force. "Here," as the *Pravda*, central newspaper of the C.P.S.U., declared on January 5, 1935, "is the essence of the whole affair"!

All these data were ascertained and established by the public prosecutor of the U.S.S.R., and augmented by the personal depositions of the members of the "Leningrad Centre." On the basis of these data, the indictment formulated the general conclusion that

"the aims and methods of struggle of this counter-revolutionary terrorist group in Leningrad fully coincide with

the aims and methods of the open enemies of the people—such as the emigré white-guardist, landlord-capitalist organisations, 'The Russian All-Army Union,' and the 'Brotherhood of Russian Truth' (adherents of Denikin), who openly preach terror, who brought about the murder of Comrades V. V. Vorovsky and P. L. Voykov, and systematically send their agents to U.S.S.R. territory in order to organise and perpetrate terrorist acts against representatives of the Soviet power."

All these facts disclosed in Court and given the widest publicity render it possible to draw the following conclusions:—

(1) The history of the development of the Zinoviev fractional group shows that it was THE MOST TREACHEROUS AND DESPICABLE OF ALL THE FRACTIONAL GROUPS IN THE HISTORY OF OUR PARTY. It was the only group which, in its practical activity, turned double-dealing into a system. By transforming double-dealing into the MAIN method in its relations with the Party it THEREBY TOOK THE SAME PATH AS THAT TAKEN BY WHITEGUARD WRECKERS AND PROVOCATEURS.

(2) The Zinoviev group was the only one in the history of our Party which found it possible to resort to terror, as a method of struggle against the Party and its leaders. Fundamentally, it WAS A MASKED FORM OF WHITEGUARD ORGANISATION, FULLY DESERVING THAT ITS MEMBERS SHOULD BE TREATED AS WHITEGUARDS.

The Voice of the Workers.

Such are the monstrous facts of perfidy and treachery disclosed by the proletarian court, which guards the interests of the proletarian revolution.

"The counter-revolutionary fascist reptiles must be crushed! Death to the murderers and their accomplices, no quarter to the enemies of the people! Greater Party and revolutionary vigilance on all fronts of the struggle of the proletariat and socialist construction! We must take better care of our proletarian leaders!"—

such was the unanimous voice of the workers and collective farmers in the land of the Soviets at hundreds of thousands of meetings of protest against the crime committed by the fascist-white-guard assassins. At these meetings the just verdict of the Supreme court, which sentenced the organisers and perpetrators of the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov, was greeted with enthusiasm.

This revolutionary wrath of the workers and collective farmers of the Soviet Union against the fascist-white-guard scum is shared by the advanced revolutionary workers of the whole capitalist world. During these days the editorial offices of Soviet newspapers received numerous letters from groups of workers in various capitalist countries. Here are samples of what these proletarians write. These people are alien to any sort of hypocritical pacifism, and approve the measures of revolutionary defence of the U.S.S.R. taken against the fascist barbarism, introduced into the land of

Socialism by these vile degenerates of the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group:

"Let us answer with two blows for every blow of the enemy. Death to the foes of the working class," wrote workers of Burgdorf (Austria) in a collective letter. "We express in advance our agreement with the sentence to be meted out, which the murderers will deserve," wrote some workers from Amsterdam (Holland). "The main thing—no clemency," wrote proletarians of Pas de Calais (France). "From this example we see how dangerous are the last convulsions of the conquered class," wrote workers from Hilka Bitka (Czecho-Slovakia). "They must be repulsed as severely and consistently as possible, because here it is a question of the fate of toiling humanity." "Every one who was even remotely connected with this murderous crime must be mercilessly dealt with. We greet the decisions of the Soviet government and consider them quite just," wrote workers from Nesseldorf (Czecho-Slovakia). "We hope that the murderers and those who inspired them will be punished mercilessly in the interests of the proletariat of the whole world," wrote workers from Rotterdam.

Such is the unanimous attitude of the advanced revolutionary workers in the capitalist world to this fascist-white-guardist Zinoviev brood; such are their demands for the merciless punishment of the enemies of the proletarian revolution. The experience of fascist terror and revolutionary battles has taught them much. To-day these workers are far more numerous than heretofore. They are to be counted in tens of millions. Soon they will become the absolute majority in the capitalist countries. Then, replying with two blows to every blow of the enemy, they will rise to the victorious battle for power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for Soviets. The future belongs to them, the advanced revolutionary proletarians.

Between them and the treacherous leaders of social-democracy there is an impassable chasm already. The full depth of this will become apparent if we compare Hitler's paper, the *Voelkische Beobachter*, with the Czech paper, the *Sozial-Demokrat*, or the British *Blackshirt* (Mosley's paper), with the Labour (?) *Daily Herald*, which, faced with the fact that the fascist-white-guardist bandits had been executed in the U.S.S.R., found a common language. They united in a common enmity and hatred of the Fatherland of all toilers. This was open and bestial on the part of the fascists, and hypocritically masked on that of social-democrats, concealed by phrases about super-class "justice," "humanity" and "benevolence."

Touching Unison of Labour Leaders and Fascists.

We call the attention of the world proletariat to the *Blackshirt*—mouthpiece of the British fascist Mosley — which kissed the lips of the reformist Labour Leaders for their slanderous campaign against the Soviet Union (barely covered by their hypocritical assurances of "sympathy" for the U.S.S.R.) (*Blackshirt*, December 28, 1934):

"The *Daily Herald* has at last summed up sufficient

courage to make some editorial reference to the mass executions that have recently been taking place in Soviet Russia. . . As the *Herald* says: 'the Russian executions are barbarous and unworthy of a régime which professes to be the most advanced in the world.'

The leaders of the Labour Party and the General Council of the Trade Union Congress have apparently lost the ability to differentiate between revolutionary self-defence on the part of the proletarian state, against capitalist barbarism, and white-guardist-fascist barbarism itself. It is precisely for this that the organ of the British fascists praises them. We shall deal with this subject in greater detail further on.

We call the attention of the workers of the world to the Czech *Social-Demokrat*, which repeats the infamous canard spread by the German fascist sheet, the *Voelkische Beobachter*, almost word for word, attempting to present the executions of the white-guardists in the U.S.S.R. as a variation of the events of "June 30th." Of course, the *Sozial-Demokrat* understands quite well (but passes over in silence) that Hitler and Goering instituted the slaughter of the Storm Troop leaders. It did this to consolidate the bloody dictatorship of monopoly capital, and maintain its terrorist anti-popular power at a time of rising dissatisfaction with the Hitler régime among the deluded masses of the people. This dissatisfaction was penetrating into the ranks of the Storm detachments themselves. The proletarian court in the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, has executed an insignificant handful of traitors to the proletarian fatherland. These individuals had no connections whatsoever with the masses of the people in the U.S.S.R., and only contrived to make contact with the fascist bourgeoisie abroad. They shot at the leaders of the proletariat, who enjoy the boundless love and confidence of the whole toiling population of the great socialist Soviet Republic.

We also call the attention of the workers to the fact that none other than Emile Vandervelde took first place in this anti-Soviet campaign. He not only repeated the squeals about the "barbarism" of the Bolsheviks, uttered by his native bourgeoisie, and the entire white-guardist rabble caught in the act of organising criminal terrorist outrages; he not only compared the just act of proletarian revolutionary justice with the butchery of the bloody Russian autocrat, Nicholas II., but he also utilised his speech to attempt to sow discord in the friendly relations between the U.S.S.R. and France. It is well known that German fascism is now straining every effort to achieve precisely the aim which the chairman of the Second International has set himself. We leave it to the proletariat of the world to judge in whose interests this anti-Soviet statement of Emile Vandervelde was made.

We cannot pass in silence the fact that the *Populaire*, the organ of the French socialists (who have established a united front with the Communists) published a document issued by the Russian Menshevik-interventionists, who protested hypocritically against the terror in the U.S.S.R. and took Zinoviev, Kamenev and the terrorists under their protecting wing. Has the *Populaire* forgotten that the Russian Mensheviks organised uprisings against the Soviet Government (for example, in Yaroslavl, in 1918)? Has it forgotten the collaboration of the Mensheviks in white-guardist butchery, when the representatives of the Menshevik Party participated in the "governments," and were even desirable people on the staffs of the tsarist generals, "liberating" Russia from the Bolsheviks? Is it possible that the facts, exposed in open court in 1930, regarding the wrecking activities of the Mensheviks who established connections with the interventionist bourgeois-landlord "Industrial Party" on the one hand, and with the consulate of a foreign imperialist power on the other, are already forgotten? The Russian Mensheviks are consistent: yesterday they were caught red-handed as wreckers and interventionists, and to-day they take upon themselves the rôle of defenders of fascist-white-guardist terrorists. Can Leon Blum's sanctimonious and hypocritical explanation of the reasons which led him to print this letter of his "friends—the Mensheviks," satisfy any perplexed French proletarian? Is the fact that the Russian Mensheviks, manoeuvring in the face of the powerful will of the working masses for a united front, signed the declaration issued by a number of "left" social-democratic parties at the last session of the Executive Committee of the Second International, enough to explain why this base anti-Soviet document, beneficial only to the fascists and white-guardists, was printed in a newspaper ostensibly for a united front with the Communists? Every conscious proletarian will answer that it is not. This is no justification. It is merely a hypocritical excuse which testifies, to say the very least, that the dissemination of anti-Soviet slanders is tolerated. It is an act inimical to the working class struggle against fascism, the war danger and capitalist offensive. It is a deed inimical to the unity of action of the proletariat, weakening it before the class enemy.

The Paris Reformist Council of Trade Unions went still further in its anti-Soviet lying campaign and issued "a protest" against the shooting of "one hundred workers"!! in the U.S.S.R. by sentence of the High Court. The leaders of the

reformist Trade Unions kept silent when the news arrived that Comrade Kirov was foully murdered. They kept silent when the French workers were filled with revolutionary indignation against those who inspired and committed this fascist-whiteguard crime. The Paris Reformist Trade Union Council only raised its voice when the sword of proletarian justice fell on the whiteguard terrorists, the degenerates of the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, among whom, as is well known, there was not a single worker. The reformist Council rose in defence of these fascist whiteguard terrorists against the Soviet Union, against the fatherland of the toilers of the whole world!

Such is the class differentiation in the appraisal of the infamous murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov. At one pole the advanced revolutionary workers of the whole world, together with the U.S.S.R., who are consistently opposed to any and all class enemies of the proletariat. At the other—all those Vanderveldes, Otto Bauers, Norman Thomases and Menshevik interventionists who utilise the still existing pacifist illusions of the toiling masses to assist their "native" bourgeoisie and discredit the Soviet Union. A wide section of workers still exists who are wholeheartedly on the side of the Soviet Union, but not yet fully convinced of the duplicity of capitalist justice with its alleged super-class "equality." They have not yet shaken their ancient slavish servility to the capitalists off and still allow themselves to be deceived by the odious morals of the Christian preachers. These teach them "turn the other cheek." At the same time they bless the banners of the fascist hordes when advancing with fire and sword on the working class quarters.

It is to these honest, though misguided, proletarians, deluded by the capitalist and social-democratic press, who seek a reply to their quandaries and doubts, that we must patiently explain the substance of these events.

The Inevitable Logic of Anti-Party Struggle.

You, social-democratic workers, cannot understand how it was possible that the anti-Soviet Zinoviev-Trotsky bloc, at one time a fraction within Communism, could take the path of terror and anti-Soviet fascist-white-guardist struggle against the leaders of the Soviet state and the Communist Party.

Is such a development unexpected or unusual? Of course not! The history of the Communist Parties has proven that those elements who launch an anti-Party struggle against the Leninist line of the Party and its leadership, invariably find themselves finally—provided they continue to be obstin-

* See *Menshevik Trial; Wreckers on Trial*, Modern Books, Ltd.

ate—in the camp of the worst enemies of the proletariat.

In the ideological struggle of the revolutionary Marxists against the revisionists and later against the centrists of social-democracy, the great Lenin foresaw, more than 30 years ago, the eve of the revolutionary battles of the proletariat. He foresaw that, having sharpened all disputed questions and concentrated all differences of opinion on points with an immediate bearing in determining the conduct of the masses, the proletarian revolution would place the Menshevik Party on the other side of the class barricades. This is precisely what happened. To end the rule of the bourgeoisie and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets, the Bolsheviks had to overthrow the bourgeois-landlord government of Kerensky, the government of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, by means of an armed uprising. The proletarians of the whole world should remember to-day that in those decisive days of 1917, the contemptible leaders of the Zinoviev group were not with the insurgent proletariat. They were in favour of agreement with the Mensheviks who, with the Junkers, defended the accursed system of capitalist slavery. What is more, they were a strike-breaking, treacherous and perfidious group. When the Bolshevik Party, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, was preparing to storm the fortress of capitalism in Russia, Zinoviev and Kamenev, who up to that time had waged a sharp struggle within the Party against the armed uprising and the seizure of power by the proletariat, and were severely defeated within the Party and its Central Committee, treacherously wrote to the non-Party press and divulged the decision of the Central Committee regarding the armed uprising to the bourgeoisie. Lenin called this a strike-breaking act and direct treason to the proletariat. Lenin gave a popular explanation to the workers of the meaning of the shameful conduct of these cowards and deserters from the front of the socialist revolution.

"Is it difficult to understand," said Lenin, "that it is permissible to be either for or against a strike BEFORE the Centre comes to a decision on the question, but that AFTER a decision has been made in favour of a strike (and an additional decision has been made to conceal it from the enemy), it is strike-breaking then to agitate against the strike? Every worker will understand this.

"Kamenev and Zinoviev have BETRAYED to Rodzianko and Kerensky the decision of the Central Committee of their Party regarding the armed uprising and as to concealing from the enemy the preparations for that uprising . . ."

Lenin demanded the expulsion of the strike-breakers and traitors—Zinoviev and Kamenev—from the Party.

The day after the proletariat had conquered

power, Zinoviev and Kamenev repeated their treachery by proposing to cede the power won to the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries by forming a "coalition" government of all the so-called "socialist parties." They conducted negotiations with the Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, agreeing to remove Lenin from the post of Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and replace him by the counter-revolutionary Avksentyev or Chernov.

No wonder Lenin did not consider this treacherous policy of Kamenev and Zinoviev in the October days accidental. It was bound to come to the fore, as it actually did in the years when neo-Menshevism began to constitute itself in the Soviet Union, under the ideological leadership of Trotsky.

As the great Lenin in the past, so the great Stalin (who continues Lenin's work) foresaw, in the theoretical and tactical disputes of the reconstruction period, the inevitable and open transition of the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition (at that time only a social-democratic deviation within the Communist Party) to the class enemy. Whereas in Lenin's days the main and basic question dividing the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks was that of the dictatorship of the proletariat (and prior to that the hegemony of the proletariat as the embryo of, and stepping-stone to, its dictatorship), so later, when the dictatorship had already been won, the basic question dividing them into irreconcilable camps was that formulated by Lenin and brilliantly developed by Stalin, namely, the question of the possibility of building socialism in one country.

"In my opinion," wrote Stalin in 1926, "a lack of faith in the upbuilding of socialism is the basic error of the new opposition. I call it a "basic error," because all the other mistakes of the new opposition are grounded upon it. The mistakes of the new opposition in the matter of the New Economic Policy, State capitalism, the nature of our socialist industry, the function of co-operation under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the best way of fighting the kulaks, the rôle and the importance of the middle peasants — all these mistakes are the outcome of the one primary blunder they all depend upon, a lack of faith in the establishment of a socialised society by the forces of our own country. (Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I., p. 64.)

Whoever denies the possibility of constructing socialism in the U.S.S.R.—this was the common platform of Zinoviev and Trotsky—must inevitably turn to the path of capitalist restoration, no matter how much he embellishes it with "Left" phrases. This ideological foundation brought about the anti-Soviet demonstration organised by the Trotsky-Zinoviev "opposition" on November 7th, 1927, and the subsequent treacherous fascist shot in Leningrad. The vile chain of treachery, hypocritical double-faced recantations, and unprincipled anti-Party blocs with every fragment of former oppositions, both Right and "Left," both

inside the C.S.S.U. and the other parties of the Communist International, finally reduced this most despicable of all oppositions—the Zinoviev-anti-Soviet group—to establishing CONNECTIONS with the terrorist interventionist “Leningrad Centre,” which was its own product. Thus was closed this ignominious chain of uninterrupted treachery, brought to a close by laying the odious fascist-white-guardist face of the dregs of the Zinoviev-anti-Soviet group bare.

But the leaders of social-democracy will tell you, social-democratic workers, that the Zinovievites and the Trotskyites are Marxists. And Marxists are opponents of individual terror.

But is it not clear that the counter-revolutionary Zinoviev-Trotsky bloc ceased to be a Marxist group long ago. It uses “Marxist” phrases only to conceal its rôle of vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and mask its white-guard-fascist essence.

From its very inception, the Trotsky-Zinoviev platform contained within itself a poisonous seed capable of developing into white-guard bandit practice. It made declarations from the very beginning about the “Thermidorean degeneration”* of the Soviet Government and of the Party; from the very beginning, while still a fraction within the Party, it formulated the famous analogy with a speech made by Clemenceau, the meaning of which was, that it planned to stab the Party in the back should intervention take place.

Trotsky—Bloodhound of Counter-Revolutionary Murder.

It is, therefore, not accidental that when the underground anti-Soviet group of Zinovievites became active in the Soviet Union in 1933, the ideological leader of the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc abroad formulated a thesis on the struggle against the Soviet power by means of violence. On December 7th, 1933, a year before the dastardly murder of Comrade Kirov in Leningrad, the *Neue Weltbühne* published an article by Trotsky entitled “Two Perspectives of the Soviet Union.” In that article Trotsky openly formulated the question of armed methods of struggle against the leaders of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party.

“In the U.S.S.R.,” he said, “it will be possible to compel the bureaucrats to hand power over to the proletarian vanguard (i.e., the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists—Ed.) only by the use of force. The lackeys will immediately begin to sing in a chorus that the ‘Trotskyists,’ as well as Kautsky, preach armed uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat. But let us continue.”

The counter-revolutionary Trotsky explained further on wherein he differed with Kautsky, who called for an armed uprising.

“In any event, it will not be a question of an uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat, but of removing (by force!—Ed.) a malignant sore.”

Thus did Trotskyism pave the way ideologically for the terrorists!

To coincide with what point did Trotsky time this “removal of a malignant sore,” this disorganization of the leadership of the Soviet Government, to use the words of the indictment against the “Leningrad Centre,” by acts of terror directed against the leaders of the Soviet power so as to bring about a change of the existing policy in the spirit of the so-called Zinoviev-Trotsky platform?

To this question the seasoned wolf of counter-revolution gave a clear and unequivocal reply:

“The correlation of forces (necessary for such a murderous act—Ed.) will be established by some great historical trial, such as may even be a war.”

This despicable calculation on intervention needs no commentary.

* * *

Your social-democratic press is attempting to convince you, social-democratic workers, that the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov is witness to an alleged accumulation of discontent among the masses of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. bordering almost on a “crisis” in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is allegedly compelled to resort to mass terror to save itself. The workers in all countries will enjoy a hearty laugh at this counter-revolutionary nonsense which the social-democratic leaders have clearly hired from the fascists. The underground anti-Soviet group lived its own life, completely isolated from the masses, which had nothing in common with that of the workers and peasants in the U.S.S.R. The difficulties facing the construction of Socialism rallied the Party and the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. to overcome them as speedily as possible, while these difficulties brought joy to the Zinoviev group and roused them to anti-Soviet struggle. The tremendous successes achieved by Socialism filled the workers with pride in their country and stimulated them to undertake a still more enthusiastic struggle to build classless society. Their effect on the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group was only to embitter them and urge the most degenerate elements in the group to take to terror, and to establish ever closer contacts with the fascist bourgeoisie.

The terrorists began to shoot at the leaders of the proletariat because the victory of Socialism had become indisputable and their hopes for mass movements against the Soviet Government had disappeared. Only one road remained—namely, that of white-guard terror and foreign intervention.

In 1933 already the dregs of the Zinoviev group

* Thermidor: The period of the beginning of the decline of the Great French Revolution.

(which began to get active about that time) bolstered themselves up with the hope that the steps taken by the Soviet Government would collapse and that its internal and external difficulties would become intensified. We should call to mind that new difficulties were disclosed in the villages at the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933, connected with the socialist re-education of collective farmers. This called for new efforts by our Party, and new methods of Party work in the village to make the collective farms Bolshevik farms, and collective farmers well-to-do.

At this period Comrade Stalin delivered his speeches regarding work in the village,* and provided the Communists with a programme in this sphere for the coming years.

We should also recall that this was also the time when the fascists came to power in Germany, and the danger of a counter-revolutionary war on the Soviet Union from east and west was sharply intensified.

These external and internal difficulties were the nutritious soil in which the seeds of the anti-Soviet activity of the Zinoviev group flourished. The group awaited an intensification of these difficulties. They awaited intervention.

Socialist Victories Blast Opposition Hopes.

But the mighty Party frustrated these calculations of the enemies of the proletariat. Under the brilliant leadership of Stalin it defended the cause of peace and strengthened the international position of the Soviet Union. The diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union by the U.S.A., the establishment of friendly relations with France and with the countries of the Little and Balkan Entente, the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, such were its consistent successes in the realm of international relations.

Thanks to the gigantic advance of industry in 1934 (the production of cast-iron and steel increased by 45 per cent. as against last year)—the U.S.S.R. established itself firmly as an industrial country, holding second place in the world and first in Europe.

We have achieved victory on the agrarian front, despite drought and crop failure in a number of regions. Thanks to Bolshevik organisation and the advantages of the collective farm system, we have gathered 250-300 million poods of grain more than in 1933 and more than at any time in the existence of the Soviet Government! Finally, the abolition of the card (ration) system for bread and a series of other commodities of primary consump-

tion—a measure which speaks volumes of the vast improvement in the supplies of foodstuffs and industrial products in the hands of the Soviet State — testifies that a most important step has been taken on the road to ensuring the fulfilment of the instructions of the Second Five-Year Plan regarding the increase, by 2 to 2½ times, scheduled in products consumed by the masses in the Soviet Union.

It was in these conditions of the progress of socialist industry and the advance of agriculture that the shot was fired. This was an act of desperation. It expressed the mortal agony of the capitalist elements in the land of the Soviets, dying off, smashed, but not yet wiped out. It was a shot of revenge for the gigantic victories being achieved by Socialism. It was a shot of political revenge upon a leader who smashed the remnants of the accursed Zinoviev anti-Soviet group in Leningrad.

Thus we must bear in mind that to the degree that our forces grow our enemy will not become more tame and harmless as the Right-wingers have asserted. On the contrary, the more hopeless the situation our enemies are in, the more willingly will they resort to "extreme measures," to the weapon of individual terror as the only weapon of people doomed in their struggle against the Soviet Government.

Not a single worker, not a single collective farmer, belonged to this hide-bound terroristic group, which lacked any contact whatsoever with the masses. These people—the Zinoviev offspring—were parasites on the mighty body of socialist society. These people—the dregs of the Zinoviev group—established contact with foreign interventionists. They attempted to bite like snakes to disorganise the Soviet power and its victorious construction of a classless socialist society. In vain! These vipers have been crushed. Great is the sorrow of the workers and collective farmers of the land of the Soviets at the grave of their slain leader! But the forward march of millions of builders of Socialism is victorious. The rifle is firmly held in the hands of the guardians of peaceful socialist labour.

Just Retribution to Murderous Terrorists' 'Barbarism'?

The social-democratic leaders are attempting to tell you, workers, that the execution of white-guard-fascist bandits in the U.S.S.R. is "barbarism" allegedly unworthy of the great land of Socialism.

What a fake such agitation is! It is calculated to deceive you, social-democratic workers! These impostors themselves understand quite well that the severe measures applied by the Soviet Government against the handful of bandits is the revolu-

* *Work in the Rural Districts.* Modern Books, Ltd.

tionary self-defence of the proletariat against capitalist-fascist barbarism. The white-guard-fascist terrorism to which the leader of the Leningrad Bolsheviks, Sergei Mironovich Kirov, beloved by workers and collective farmers, fell victim is a clear manifestation of capitalist barbarism. This is the very terrorism which is being applied on a mass scale by the Hitlerites in Germany. They torture their victims in the dungeons of the "Gestapo," and shoot hundreds of workers while "attempting to escape," simulating the alleged suicides of the strangled and tortured heroes of the proletarian struggle. This is the very terrorism which covered the mining regions of Asturias and the workers' quarters of Oviedo in Spain with blood. It is the same fascist terrorism which was responsible for the assassination of Duk in Rumania, Dollfuss in Austria and Barthou and King Alexander in Marseilles.

It is only thanks to Soviet power that the Soviet workers and collective farmers and the U.S.S.R. as a whole have rid themselves of this capitalist-fascist barbarism. The workers and collective farmers have destroyed the last remnants of the capitalist class—the kulaks, who used their last breath to sight a sawed-off shot-gun! Now these dastardly remnants of the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group and tens of hired white-guard assassins smuggled over the borders of the U.S.S.R. are attempting to introduce these criminal tactics of underhand assassination into the land of the Soviets! The Soviet proletariat and the Soviet Government will not tolerate the growth of this capitalist barbarism in the Soviet Union. It is imported from fascist countries and finds support in the insignificant capitalist elements within the Soviet Union who have been smashed but are not yet fully eliminated. The Soviet Government has taken, and will continue to take, the most severe measures of revolutionary self-defence against such barbarism.

It should be clear to every worker that the proletarian state, whose colossal aims are now materialising, which is victoriously building classless socialist society, transforming the noblest dreams of toiling humanity into reality, will implacably defend all this from the encroachment of capitalist barbarism and white-guard-fascist terrorism. It will unhesitatingly shoot any person proved guilty of transplanting this capitalist barbarism from without, from the countries of fascism into that of Soviets!

At the same time the social-democratic leaders—defending white-guard terrorism and aiding and abetting the fascist assassins—are raising their voices "in protest," ostensibly in the name of civilisation, justice, humanity, etc., etc.

What a pitiful and contemptible spectacle!

Once when contemplating such a picture (which has repeated itself more than once in the course of the class struggle of the proletariat) Vladimir Ilyich Lenin exclaimed in anger:—

"... and our 'men with their brief cases,' the dregs of the bourgeois intellectuals who call themselves 'social-democrats' and 'socialists,' sing the praises of the bourgeoisie and blame the revolution for any manifestations of ferocity, or for the inevitable severity of the measures used in the struggle against especially sharp cases of ferocity, although it is as clear as daylight that this ferocity is a product of the imperialist war (and we would now say, of the fascists and white-guards, Ed.) and that no revolution can release itself of such consequences of the war (and now of fascism, Ed.) without a lengthy struggle, without a series of severe measures of repression."

Yes. There is a vast difference between the mass red terror of 1918-1919 in Soviet Russia and the present shootings of a pack of white-guard terrorists. At that time the revolutionary workers and poor peasants, surrounded on all sides by white-guard armies, were making short shrift of the counter-revolutionary elements of the bourgeois and landlord classes who were still strong in our country. That was a form of civil war against classes, which, although conquered, were nevertheless still strong by virtue of their connections and the funds still in their possession, etc. Now the Soviet State is still further consolidating its revolutionary legal code. The decisions of the November Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. are one big step forward in this direction. Now the stern sword of proletarian justice has fallen upon a miserable handful of white-guard-fascist terrorists, the majority of whom penetrated into the U.S.S.R. from abroad, from capitalist countries; it has fallen upon a handful of counter-revolutionary degenerates, who had neither connection with the masses nor influence upon them. The whole of the toiling population—through its workers' and peasants' Soviet Government—has executed these criminals to teach others to keep their vile murderous claws off the land constructing Socialism, and not to violate its peaceful toil by perfidious shots from the underground haunts of the white-guard-fascists.

Soon after the murder by the white-guardists of the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Comrade Voykov, L. Kamenev, one of the contemptible leaders of the Zinoviev group, attempted to mumble something against the execution of twenty "MOST ILLUSTRIOUS" ones in reply to this crime, under the pretext that these executions would alienate the U.S.S.R. from sections of bourgeois pacifists in the West.

Comrade Stalin at that time replied:

"What are we to say of this reactionary-liberal philosophy? We can only say this of it, that its authors

would like to see the U.S.S.R. toothless, unarmed, prostrating itself before, and capitulating to our enemies. Belgium was once 'stained with blood,' and this was depicted at one time on cigarette cards. Why should not the U.S.S.R. be 'stained with blood'—then everybody would feel sorry for it. No, comrades! We don't agree with that! Let all these liberal-pacifist philosophers betake themselves to the devil with their 'sympathy' for the U.S.S.R. With the sympathy of the millions of toilers everything else could be accomplished. And if it is essential that anybody be stained with blood, we shall do every-

thing possible to ensure that some capitalist country is beaten, stained with blood, and not the U.S.S.R."

In 1935, the same as in 1926, these principles of conduct, formulated by Comrade Stalin, remain immutable laws of the revolutionary defence of Socialism against capitalist barbarism, and bear the unqualified approval of all workers and collective farmers.

A YEAR OF GREAT ADVANCES

THE working class throughout the world crosses the threshold of the year 1935 feeling a growing confidence in its own strength.

On New Year's Day, the Pope of Rome and the King of England, the dictator of fascist Germany and the Presidents of the most democratic republics, by tradition sanctified by centuries of the slavery and exploitation of toiling mankind, proclaimed, "first and last," the eternal inviolability of sacred property in land. But the march of time is no longer in their power.

On the threshold of a new round of revolutions, the page of history named "1934," which we now turn, has marked other "beginnings" than those the bourgeoisie inscribed, writhing in the throes of the struggle for the capitalist way out of the crisis, for the transfer of the cost of the economic crisis and the general crisis of capitalism to the shoulders of the toiling masses and oppressed, weak peoples. Let the bourgeoisie throughout the world still continue to make a frenzied onslaught on the working class, increasing the fascist methods by which they rule day by day. Let the heavy heel of fascism continue to violate the ground where the best sons of the working class are daily shedding their blood for the liberation of toiling mankind. Let frenziedly savage chauvinism set forth the "Myth of the 20th century" and welcome the "dawn" of the new year with the militant teutonic shout of the fascist minister-poet:

"Hey, France-man, this is a menacing morning greeting!
You must die that we may live . . ."

Let them. . . Let the myth that fascism was to rule a thousand years, proclaimed in streams of blood of the German proletariat two years ago appear to the imagination of the cowards, renegades, defeatists and bourgeois hangers-on, to the leaders of social-democracy seeking an excuse for

their utter bankruptcy, a whole historic period of reaction, a "new epoch of fascism." Let them persuade the working class that it is impossible to make a simple leap over this epoch, but that it is historically necessary to wait, and abandon the gains of a whole century of the working class movement to be plundered by the fascists, comforting themselves by the consciousness that history in the long run works in their favour.

The glorious year of 1934 will enter the annals of history as a year of great socialist victories won by the mighty land of the proletarian dictatorship, as a year of heroic battles fought by the working class against fascism. It will mark the beginning of the end of the hypnotism wherewith fascism, especially after its victories in Germany in 1933, attempted to hold back the process of historic development. This is the failure of its effort to imbue the masses with the legend of the impregnability of fascism and the monolithic character of the fascist state. The year 1934 will go down in history as a year of great change in the establishment of the united front of the working class against fascism, the capitalist offensive and imperialist war — a year of great advances made in the consciousness of millions of social-democratic workers becoming convinced, by bitter experience, that the path along which the social-democrats have led them is that of defeat of the working class and inevitable fascist slavery. It will live in history as a year of enormous growth in the political influence of Communism. In history it will be a year of the maturing of the revolutionary crisis. These historic changes came to maturity in the February barricades, built by the Schutzbunders in Vienna, in the February general strike of four million workers, as well as the barricade fighting in France, and the great October battles fought by the Spanish proletariat. What though the working class lost the first open skir-

mishes! The decisive point, however, in determining the results of 1934 is the fact that the bourgeoisie have become undoubtedly weaker while the revolution has moved forward, the fact that new revolutionary prerequisites have been established for the forthcoming victories of the working class. In Floridsdorf and Asturias, the proletarian insurgents have temporarily left the direct field of battle. But millions of toilers, filled with hatred for fascism and capitalist exploitation, roused by the smell of powder throughout the capitalist world, enheartened by the gigantic successes achieved by socialism in the U.S.S.R., are taking the historic stage, conscious of the growth of their fighting power. The main thing is that the masses are being filled with a realisation that victorious resistance to the fascist onslaught is possible. In some sectors they are resorting to the highest forms of struggle. With every day that passes the organising rôle of the proletarian vanguard, the Communist Party, is increasing. There has been a decline in the belief in the power of the bourgeoisie. The masses are realising that fascism cannot destroy the working class and its Communist Party. Fascism is not overcoming the economic difficulties facing it, but is intensifying them still further. It is increasing the tremendous poverty of the masses still further. It is losing its mass basis, and there is no return to the past. Such are the chief results of the year 1934. Not with tearful, timid hopes, leaving the future in the hands of superhuman forces, nor by waiting peacefully in the cellars of history does the working class greet the New Year, but rises to its full height, and takes in its hands the ideological and material arms which alone enable it to hammer out its own future and that of toiling mankind. The working class is taking its place under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, and a rifle into its hands.

Socialist Triumphs in U.S.S.R.

On the threshold of the year that has passed, the historic congress of the shock brigade of the Communist International took place. Here the magnificent results of the construction of socialism were dealt with in the report delivered by the mighty Stalin. This report is the most brilliant document of the era. No one gave a better formulation of the importance of this speech than one of the best and most brilliant of the galaxy of disciples and pupils of the leader of the world proletariat, namely, Comrade Kirov, who fell at the dastardly hands of the dregs of the Zinoviev group. These latter rallied on the basis of a Trotskyite-Zinoviev platform, and sinking literally to fascist depths, having finally broken away from

the masses, demoralised and taking their revenge by shooting from behind at the stupendous victories achieved by socialism.

"As the result of all the work we have done, we have at the present stage such a development of the dictatorship of the working class in our country as we never had before. We now have a mighty Soviet state, working really powerfully and firmly knit together, one which has created the foundations of socialist economy. This gives tremendous moral satisfaction not only to the working class and the millions of collective farmers in our country, but it is the best agitator and the most powerful propagandist for the cause of socialism, outside the borders of our country, among the international proletariat, among all the oppressed, East and West." (From the speech delivered by the late Comrade Kirov at the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

There are no fortresses which Bolsheviks cannot capture, said Comrade Stalin. The Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. set out a huge programme for the construction of the edifice of socialism in the U.S.S.R., in the year 1934. The Christmas chimes hardly had time to announce the prayers of the bourgeoisie that their tottering kingdom be saved, when the powerful victorious chorus of the giants of the Five-Year Plan rang out, the signal that the instructions given by the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. for the production of ten million tons of pig iron in 1934 were fulfilled. This quantity is two-and-a-half times more than Tsarist Russia produced. It is more than any country in capitalist Europe is producing. It is a guarantee of the further powerful growth of industrialisation in the U.S.S.R., and the unprecedented growth of the well-being of the working class. This amount of pig iron means hundreds of thousands of tractors which will plough the fields of the collective farm deeply. These fields, by the Bolshevik organisation of the collective farms, will produce a harvest unknown in Tsarist Russia. It has already created the conditions for the abolition of bread cards and a new advance of the movement to collectivisation. This pig iron is the steel armour in which the invincible Red Army is clothed on the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. Look at it, the steel steed of which Lenin, the greatest genius of mankind, constantly dreamed. This is how the instructions given by Stalin, the greatest genius of our epoch, to overtake and surpass capitalist Europe in the course of ten years are being fulfilled. Look at it, the great socialist plan based on Marxist scientific foresight, the revolutionary energy of the toiling masses, and the iron unity and solidarity of the ranks of the Bolsheviks. This is the plan which the fustian heroes of the Second International called the "Bolshevik experiment." The counter-revolutionary Trotskyite-Zinoviev degenerates described it as "Thermidor." Look at the socialist fatherland, with its heroes of labour, which produced the valiant Chelyuskinites,

the Kamanins and Molokovs, which has raised tens of millions of people from uncultured neglect and want to heights hitherto impossible for them to attain. In one year it has created material and cultural values such as could only be produced under capitalism in the course of decades, or such as it is entirely impossible to produce under such a system. Here we have not the mythical, but the actual liberation of mankind. Here we have progress of which only the boldest thinkers and teachers of socialism ever dreamed. Here history has given a short though comprehensive reply to the question framed by St. Simon in France at the beginning of last century, namely, where would France lose most: if it lost 3,000 capable workers or 3,000 princes, generals, ministers, priests and lawyers. For the least known of the builders and enthusiasts of socialism, and the least known of the proletarian revolutionaries who fall under the knife of the fascist murderers has incomparably greater rights to a place in history than any of the "great" bourgeoisie, because he personifies the real progress of mankind.

On the threshold of the New Year, at a time when the world economic crisis was turning to a depression, in a situation where social-democracy and the opportunists of all kinds were speculating on an ebb of the revolutionary struggle, as capitalist economics improved, Comrade Stalin gave a keen Bolshevik analysis of the "depression of a special type," and a clear revolutionary perspective for the future. A year has passed since this happened and capitalism has nowhere been able to create the prerequisites for new capitalist stabilisation.

No prospects of a new stabilisation are visible anywhere. On the contrary, the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism has gone on without interruption. It was precipitated by a profound disturbance of the whole capitalist system, the maturing of the revolutionary crisis in the capitalist countries, and the mighty growth of the U.S.S.R. It was accentuated by development of the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies, the narrowing down of markets, the struggle for them, the deepening of imperialist contradictions and the contraction of the ability of capitalism to manoeuvre. Therefore, even a temporary growth of industrial production (which, by the way, is stagnating in some leading capitalist countries) did not retard the process of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Hence the profound significance of the words of Comrade Stalin that the idea of taking capitalism by storm is maturing in the minds of the masses, although in the overwhelming majority of countries there is no directly revolutionary situation as yet in being.

Germany.

The prerequisites for a revolutionary crisis are maturing in the chief centre of the fascist attack on Communism, namely, in national-socialist Germany. During the crisis fascism was able to take advantage of the growing indignation of the petty-bourgeois masses against the worsening of their conditions directed against the Weimar constitution. The petty-bourgeois masses fell victims to fascist demagogy because social-democracy split the working class. The Communist Party, due to the influence of social-democracy, did not as yet have the support of the decisive strata of the proletariat to such an extent as to cast them into open battle against the capitalist system, thus drawing the ruined petty-bourgeoisie into the struggle. But the same process of increasing discontent on the part of the masses led, owing to the deception in the promises of the national-socialists, to a contraction of the mass basis of fascism. June 30th brought to the surface the beginning of the crisis of the fascist dictatorship. The heroic activity of the Communist Party, more than anything else, prepared the explosion of June 30th. The Communist Party was able to stand firm in face of unparalleled fascist terror. Its agitational activity has not merely not weakened, on the contrary, it grew still stronger. It advanced new cadres of underground organisers, hard as flint. But it did not succeed in attracting the masses of the Social-Democratic Party, now becoming active, by boldly and firmly carrying out the united front. It did not yet succeed in becoming such an organising force among the masses as to be able to raise the feelings of the masses to direct action on June 30th. Hence a certain strengthening of the government apparatus of the fascist dictatorship after June 30th. This allowed it to make a number of attempts to bring about a certain regrouping of forces, while narrowing its mass basis. After June 30th, by means of terror, fascism could only drive the hatred of the masses deeper. It could not restrain the speed at which the class contradictions in Germany became sharpened. It was unable to remove the youth from the factories even to the small degree that it expected to do. In places it has to meet the open resistance of the peasants, dissolve its own national-socialist organisations in the factories, and undertake new acts of repression against the discontented elements inside the National-Socialist Party. It has to shout openly about the danger of Communism, and scare the international bourgeoisie with the danger of proletarian revolution in Germany to force them to its aid.

No, the course of history is no longer under the control of the magnates of capital. The fascist

dictatorship was able for a time to delay the process of the proletarian revolution, but it also accelerated the revolutionary process. The fascist dictatorship will not fall by itself, of course. But behind its back stands the united front of the proletariat, growing ever stronger. Its organiser, the chief gravedigger of fascism, the Party of Thaelmann, knocks heavily at the gate on the eve of 1935.

Austria.

The idea of storming capitalism is maturing in the minds of the workers of Austria, where fascism has not even been able to attract the masses by demagogy. Here, social-democracy, with a monopoly of authority over the working class and the experience of Germany before it, repeated the tactics of Wels and Stampfer step by step. They did so right up to the point of making concessions to the idea of the fascist "corporate state" and negotiations with the Christian Social Party a day before the February battles began "to avoid bloodshed." The heroic struggle of the Austrian Schutzbund was not yet a struggle for working class power. But it was an armed struggle. The leaders of social-democracy (who now complain that "the Schutzbund members expected too much from their weapons") understand quite well that when there is even a small Communist Party "criticism of weapons" may soon develop into a struggle for working class power. This is exactly what they were most afraid of. This is why even the joint theoretical organ of the Austrian and Czecho-Slovakian social-democratic parties, the *Kampf*, was compelled to admit that not only the Communists, but also the socialist workers have nothing but hatred for Austro-Marxism now. This is why social-democracy in Austria was even compelled to change the name of its party. There is no precedent in the history of the revolutionary struggle for the transformation in such a short period of a small isolated Communist organisation into a mass fighting party, the leader of the underground movement. The Communist Party of Austria achieved this by a brilliant application of the tactics of the united front, and the revolutionary everyday organisation of the masses for struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive.

Spain.

The idea of taking capitalism by storm has matured among the working class of Spain who, after four years of continuous revolutionary struggle, after attempts at Coalitions and Constituent Assemblies, after tremendous strikes and

revolutionary peasant movements, came to the armed struggle for power. Herein was the higher form of the October struggles of the Spanish proletariat as compared with the February battles of the Schutzbund in Austria. The united front of the Communists and the left social-democrats found its peculiar expression in the shape of the "Workers' Alliances," which played an active part during the general strike and the armed struggle. But all the tactics of social-democracy led to defeat. In those places where the "Workers' Alliances" really assumed power, where Soviets arose as the form of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants, growing into the proletarian dictatorship, at the centre of the uprising in Asturias and Biscay—social-democracy displayed hesitation and even treachery.

The Spanish bourgeoisie, to the sound of the approving cries of world capitalism, is taking fierce vengeance on the Asturian communards. Only the fact that social-democracy and the anarchists had the majority of the working class behind them, only the backwardness of the peasants owing to the tactics pursued by social-democracy, only the treachery of the anarcho-fascists and the irresoluteness and sometimes the direct treachery of social-democracy gave this victory to the bourgeoisie. But this is a "Pyrrhic victory,"* these are "dangerous successes." One of the prominent reactionary leaders, Calvo Sottello, stated in the Cortes:

"Anyone who thinks that political life, disturbed in its normal development by the successes of the revolution, will again return to its ordinary channel, is mistaken."

The ground is slipping from under the feet of the Spanish bourgeoisie. Leroux "defends the constitution" to soothe the masses, while the fascist Robles "criticises" the corporative system. The Spanish proletariat lost a big battle. The revolution in Spain is going ahead.

France.

In France, where the bourgeoisie was able to exploit demagogy regarding French "exceptionalism" (because this country became involved in the world economic crisis later than others), the intensification of class contradictions since the beginning of the crisis in France (and in connection with the slower transition to a depression, especially after the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany), has led to a rapid growth of fascism. This has produced the tremendous scope

* "Pyrrhic victory": A victory that is as costly as a defeat. Like that of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, over the Romans.—Ed.

of the revolutionary movement against fascism on the basis of the united front.

Utilising the support of decisive groups of French large-scale capitalists and their connections with the army and the police, the fascists made an attempt to undertake a determined attack on the working class in February, 1934. They were repulsed by mighty united front demonstrations, and a strike of four million workers such as the French working class movement has never known. THE INITIATIVE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY compelled the social-democrats to succumb to the demands made by the masses, and France became the MAIN KEYPOINT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROLETARIAN UNITED FRONT.

The united front pact is still restricted to a modest circle of questions. But the important successes arising from it are plainly to be seen. Every day that a decisive Bolshevik effort is made to inculcate the truth of this into the minds of the masses, by showing them that the united front struggle is not a manoeuvre but a weapon of class action, will widen the field of action of the united front and raise the forms of the revolutionary struggle.

In CHINA, despite the enormous mobilisation of the forces of counter-revolution and imperialism, the heroic struggle of the Red Army has shown that the SOVIETS in China are INDESTRUCTIBLE, because they base themselves on the mighty revolutionary enthusiasm of tens of millions of peasants and workers.

The huge strikes and the revolutionary upsurge in the United States, the barricade fighting in Amsterdam and Zurich, and the general strike in Greece—such were the stages of the year gone, which confirm the words of Stalin at the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. to the effect that THE REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS IS MATURING AND WILL CONTINUE TO MATURE IN THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES.

Ten years ago, Hilferding, the theoretician of the Second International, in the theoretical organ of German social-democracy, the *Gesellschaft*, founded by him, formulated the theory of organised capitalism, capitalism without crises, without wars, and without revolutions. This theory became the banner of the Second International.

"In industry," stated Hilferding, "the war and the post-war period signified a tremendous growth of the concentration tendencies of capitalism and the transition of capitalism from free competition to organised capitalism. In such organised capitalist economy the position occupied by labour changes. Unemployment becomes less threatening and its consequences are ameliorated by insurance. In the political sphere the war ended in an extension and consolidation of the democratic form of power in the chief

countries. And if we examine imperialist policy in its historic conditional state as a capitalist policy of expansion which arises from a definite phase of imperialist state policy, the question arises as to whether the issue of the war also put an end to this policy or at any rate, has there been any considerable change in it?"

Where is this "Organised" Pacifist Capitalism Now?

The basic question around which the gigantic struggle of classes in the whole capitalist world is now concentrated is the question as to who will bear the expenses of the capitalist crisis. The bourgeois politicians and scientists in all countries are breaking lances on this question, but all striving towards one aim. What does social-democracy advance in opposition to the capitalist way out of the crisis? The period of reforms has ended, announce the followers of De Man, and the question now is a change in productive relations, "state capitalism," which an examination proves to be the capitalist way out of the crisis? The question is "revolutionary dictatorship," say the Wels and Stampfers for . . . the capitalist way out of the crisis! Did not the "leading" German social-democrat use the Saar newspaper *Freiheit* to praise the predatory fascist trusts as progressive achievements of national socialism and as a "bit of socialism."

WHY DO THE SUPPORTERS OF WELS, DE MAN, STAMPFER AND HILFERDING NEED THIS?

They need it to provide a theoretical basis for their SABOTAGE OF THE UNITED PROLETARIAN FRONT AND THE CONCRETE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE against fascism, the capitalist offensive, and the capitalist way out of the crisis; big questions, they declare, are on the order of the day and the workers must not scatter their forces. They need it to advance Wels and Stampfer, and their tactics of the "lesser evil," which placed the German proletariat under the yoke of fascism; they need it to create the conditions for a repetition of these tactics by defaming the heroic struggle of the Austrian and Spanish proletariat, who have allegedly "passed the boundaries of violence." In connection with the theses about the attitude of Swiss social-democracy to war, Lenin wrote of these gentlemen:

"The aim (of the revolutionary struggle—Ed.) is declared to be 'socialism.' Socialism is contrasted to capitalism . . .

But this is (theoretically) to the highest degree illogical while practically it is without content. It is illogical because it is too general, too diffuse. 'Socialism' in general as an aim in contrast to capitalism (or imperialism) is now recognised not only by the Kautskyans and the social-chauvinists, but also by many bourgeois-social politicians. But it is not now a question of the general counterposing of two social systems, but of the CONCRETE aim of the concrete 'revolutionary mass struggle' against a concrete evil, namely, against high prices TO-DAY, the war danger TO-DAY

or the PRESENT WAR." (Lenin, *Some Points of Principle on the War Question*, Vol. XX.)

This is why the task of establishing the united front on the basis of concrete proletarian action, exposing all saboteurs of the united front in the camp of the Second International and the organisation of a fraternal joint struggle alongside all the social-democratic workers and honest social-democratic officials, who are prepared to carry it on, is the MAIN TASK FACING THE COMMUNIST VANGUARD ON THE THRESHOLD OF A NEW ROUND OF REVOLUTIONS. Only on this basis will it be possible to link up the everyday struggles with the struggle for power by the working class. The year 1934 brought an enormous contribution to the cause of the united front. The further successful operation of the tactics of the united front demands that THE CONCEPTION THAT THE UNITED FRONT IS A MANOEUVRE OR THAT IT IS CAPITULATION TO SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IS DECISIVELY ELIMINATED from among the Communists themselves.

Only the BOLSHEVIK MONOLITHIC CHARACTER of the

Communist Party AND THE IRON SOLIDARITY of its ranks, only by MERCILESSLY CLEANSING our ranks of opportunists, the petty-bourgeois hangers-on of the proletariat with the lack of principle inherent in them, can we ensure that the working class will advance to decisive victorious battles for its dictatorship. The dastardly murder of Comrade Kirov and the exposure of those who are traitors to our socialist fatherland demand that our vigilance in defence of the fortress of the world proletariat, the U.S.S.R., be raised to a maximum, that the purity of the ranks of the world Communist vanguard be ensured. Only under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, united like a wall of steel around the staff of the world proletarian revolution, headed by Comrade Stalin, the great leader of the C.P.S.U., and leader of the world proletariat, will the Communist Parties lead the working class up to the day when, according to the words of Marx in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*: "ONE DAY OF VICTORIOUS INSURRECTION ATONES FOR CENTURIES OF SHAME."

THE SITUATION IN CZECHO-SLOVAKIA AND THE TASKS OF THE UNITED FRONT

By K. GOTTWALD.

THE toiling masses of Czechoslovakia are faced with the urgent task of preventing the establishment of a fascist dictatorship.

The present government, which contains representatives of three "socialist" parties, is paving the way for a fascist dictatorship. It has already carried through a number of measures directed towards fascism, and is unceasingly coming forward with new measures of a similar character. The government has now undertaken a new attack.

At the beginning of November it declared that there is a project to introduce a new exceptional law with regard to the registration of political parties. Although the details of this law are as yet unknown, there can be practically no doubt whatever that according to this law only those parties will be recognised which stand "for the state" and its "democratic republican forms." In actual fact, the law at the present moment only threatens the Communist Party, for all the remaining parties including the fascists and irredentists* readily

express themselves in favour of both "the defence of democracy" and "the defence of the state." As a result of this new measure the C.P. of Czechoslovakia will be driven underground "on legal grounds" and deprived of all its seats in parliament, in the municipal councils, in the districts and provinces. ALL THIS WILL BE DONE WITH THE CONSENT OF THE THREE GOVERNMENTAL "SOCIALIST" PARTIES, TWO OF WHICH BELONG TO THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL!

While the present bourgeois-"socialist" governmental coalition is carrying through this preliminary preparation for open fascist dictatorship, a regrouping of the political forces of the bourgeoisie is taking place outside parliament. Several months ago the national democrats left the government. The National Democratic Party is the party of the most powerful banking group in Czechoslovakia, and linked up with the "Zhvivno Bank." This party has now become the nucleus of a NEW FASCIST BLOC in Czechish circles. Under the leadership of the biggest governmental party, the Czechish agrarians, a bloc of landowners is being formed which is striving, through the medium of the German

* Ed. Note. The irredentists are those who support unification with Germany or Austria.

agrarians (also a governmental party), to bring about co-operation with the fascists of the German "Zudet," with the "Heimatsfront" group. The Black Jesuits are also not standing idly by. The admirers of the present régime in Austria and Spain, the Jesuit *Stashek* and the former fascist *Sheimost* of the Czechish Clerical Party, are gathering together a clerical bloc, of which the fascist Party of Khlinki in Slovakia is to be a fundamental component part. Most important is that all these blocs coming into being are very closely connected politically. This was made clear, for instance, recently at the municipal elections in Pizek and Peshki. The bourgeois parties there put forward a united list of candidates, and actually operated a united front against the Communists and socialists. There in practice, all the clearly-expressed bourgeois parties, governmental and oppositional, came forward jointly. It should be borne in mind that in all these bourgeois parties an intensification of the tendency in favour of the establishment of similar co-operation within the government as well is observable. They do not hide the fact that such a government would not hesitate, in case of necessity, to operate all the laws and decrees concocted by the present bourgeois "socialist" government for the struggle against the Communists, the socialists and the socialist organisations as well. This means that whereas the revolutionary working class movement has hitherto been persecuted with the assent of the governmental socialist parties, while the governmental "socialists" are still participating in the preparations for the new exceptional law against the Communists, we are NOW FACED IN CZECHOSLOVOKIA WITH THE POSSIBILITY AND THE DANGER OF A NEW FASCIST DRIVE AGAINST THE WHOLE OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT AND ALL ITS ORGANISATIONS.

The Czechoslovakian proletariat is in this situation as a result of the policy of collaboration between the "socialist" parties and the bourgeoisie. These parties will also remain loyal to their policy in the future. The present leaders of the governmental "socialist" parties are making special efforts to retain their positions in the governmental coalition at any price, even at that of the most severe political and economic attacks upon the masses. But the masses of socialist workers are in a different frame of mind. These masses have learned the lesson of Germany, Austria and Spain, and recognise ever more clearly that fascism is the enemy of all workers irrespective of their political colouring. They know that following the repression of the Communists in Czechoslovakia, it will continue against the socialist workers and their organisations. And further, the socialist masses are beginning to understand that it is precisely the policy of their parties and leaders which brings consequences of this kind in its train.

For this reason the demand is being raised ever more openly by the masses of the proletarian members of the socialist organisations to CHANGE the policy of their party. Among the socialist workers a very unclear idea still continues to exist. It is not free from illusions, regarding the ESSENCE of such a change. None the less, this spontaneous dissatisfaction with the policy of their leaders creates favourable grounds for the idea of the united front and the movement for it led by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. For this reason the C.P. of Czechoslovakia advances the following slogans for the socialist workers:—

"Down with the policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie. Long live militant co-operation between the Communist Parties and the Socialist Parties, and the organisations of the small peasantry!"

These slogans have been produced by the necessity to create a very wide united front of all anti-fascists and their organisations against the menace of a fascist dictatorship. These slogans can rally the majority of the socialist workers and their local organisations, and place them in sharp contradiction to the leaders of their parties. They can draw them into the extra-parliamentary mass struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive. The C.P. of Czechoslovakia must increase its efforts tenfold, for the extent to which the fascist onslaught will be beaten off depends on the degree to which our Party is able to transform the dissatisfaction of the socialist workers with the policy of their party into the active extra-parliamentary struggle of important sections of the Socialist Parties, a struggle carried through in a united front with the Communists.

The C.P. of Czechoslovakia works and carries on the struggle in a very complicated situation, which is conditioned by the whole of the internal and external situation of Czechoslovakia, and its historic development.

Czechoslovakia is surrounded by states where we have open fascist dictatorships, of which at least two (Germany and Hungary) raise the question of the revision of the peace treaties very sharply. Czechoslovakia itself is a state with a mixed national composition, where six nations live together in compact masses (Czechs, Slovaks, Germans, Hungarians, Ukrainians and Poles). The dominant nation is the Czechish. But the Czechish nation is a small one, which underwent 300 years of national oppression under the yoke of the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy. It is clear that, under such conditions, the idea of the independent existence of the Czechish NATION more or less coincides, in the eyes of the masses of the toilers of the Czechish population, with the idea of present-day IMPERIALIST Czechoslovakia, which oppresses the other nations. This refers not only to the various sections of the Czechish

petty bourgeoisie (peasants, handicraft workers and the toiling intellectuals), but also to important sections of the Czechish socialist workers. What is more, it may be said with certainty that the national question is one of the MOST IMPORTANT ideological links binding the majority of the socialist workers to their parties. Further, it should be borne in mind that in comparison with the fascist régime in all the neighbouring states, the political régime in Czechoslovakia still passes as a "democratic" one and is a "lesser evil" in the eyes of the masses. It is precisely on these illusions that Benes has played when uttering his "winged" words to the effect that in central Europe, Czechoslovakia is an "island of democracy." This is one side of the question which mainly refers to the CZECHISH section of the toiling population.

Still more complicated are the processes going on among the OPPRESSED NATIONS in Czechoslovakia. Let us take for example the German, Hungarian and Polish toiling populations. In the majority, they feel themselves between the devil and the deep sea (and this, in the last analysis, can be said about all the oppressed nations in Czechoslovakia). On the one hand, there is the oppression of the Czechs, while yonder there is the threat of Hitler, Horthy and Pilsudski. The masses of the German petty-bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia, for the time being, support Hitler. This is proved by the successes achieved by the fascist organisation, the so-called "Heimatsfront" in Czechoslovakia. But the decisive actions of the German proletariat in Czechoslovakia on the other hand, the Communists and the masses of members of the Social-Democratic Party, are quite definitely hostile to Hitler and to any kind of unification of the German regions in Czechoslovakia with the present third empire. This resistance to Hitler and the fear of the Hitler régime explain why a big section of the German social-democratic workers, in spite of their oppression by the Czechish bourgeoisie, still believe in their party, which asserts that the struggle against Hitler and Hitlerism can be conducted in alliance with Czechish imperialism. The fear of the workers of the fascist régime in the neighbouring states renders it easy for social-democracy to achieve support among the proletariat of the oppressed nations for illusions regarding "Czechoslovakian democracy."

Where are the roots of all these misgivings? IN THE ABSENCE OF REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE. Only a clear revolutionary perspective, A PERSPECTIVE WHICH SHOWS THE SOLUTION OF ALL THESE QUESTIONS ALONG THE REVOLUTIONARY PATH, ON THE ROAD TO THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SOVIET POWER, only such a perspective can guard the mass of the Czechish toiling population against the possibility of new national oppression

and fascist dictatorship. Only such perspectives show the masses of the toilers of the non-Czechish nations the possibility of national liberation without the danger of falling, so to speak, out of the frying pan into the fire, i.e., out of the claws of Czechish imperialism under the whip of Horthy, Hitler and Pilsudsky. Social-democracy makes use of the above-mentioned fears to intensify democratic illusions and win support for its policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie. We must scatter these fears by showing the masses wide revolutionary perspectives, and tirelessly carry on the struggle against all democratic illusions, discrediting the policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie in all its forms.

We are fighting for the establishment of a wide united front. The proletariat will carry on a wide extra-parliamentary struggle against fascism, for the democratic rights of the toiling population, and against the capitalist offensive and the danger of war, i.e., for the most burning economic and political partial demands of the masses. To establish this united front or militant bloc we direct ourselves not only to individual socialist workers and their local organisations, but also to their parties. We must specially stress that this is not a manoeuvre but that what we are really and seriously concerned with is to rally all those who wish to fight against fascism and the capitalist offensive.

What have the Communists to tell the socialist workers in the present situation? Approximately the following:

The policy of your parties, we must say, the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie has been and remains a factor which has reduced the whole of the working class movement to such a state that we are directly faced with the menace of open fascist dictatorship. Your leaders assert that no other policy is possible since the working class is split and enfeebled. But you should clearly see that your leaders consciously substitute the consequence for the cause. What is true is that the split and enfeeblement of the ranks of the proletariat are the consequence of the collaboration of your parties with the bourgeoisie. If, therefore, they are seriously striving to consolidate the positions held by the working class, they must give up collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and agree to a united front with the Communists, to militant collaboration.

Your parties and your leaders reject the united front with the Communists on the excuse that the socialists will allegedly have to leave the government in such a case, and hand over "all power" to the reactionary bourgeois parties. This, they aver, will speed up the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. We shall again refer to their "power" within the government, and to the way they form a protective "barrier" in the government against the fascist

dictatorship. But there can be no doubt that they will really have to leave the government for they cannot serve two masters at one and the same time. But is it true that in such a case a "fascist onslaught" is inevitable? By no means. On the contrary. If our Parties take the path of class struggle against the bourgeoisie, if they accept the proposals made by the Communists and develop an extra-parliamentary struggle on the basis of militant collaboration, then the fascists of all shades will have a bad time.

And so, think over wherein lies the strength of the proletariat? In collaboration with the bourgeoisie? No! This would be equal to death. The power of the proletariat lies in the extra-parliamentary positions it occupies, in uniting its forces for the general struggle against the bourgeoisie in the factories, in the streets, and in the co-operatives, trade unions and other organisations. And it is just in this direction that the proposals made by the Communists regarding the establishment of the united front and militant collaboration were turned. And now think what the correlation of forces between the bourgeoisie and the working class will be in such a case.

In a large number of factories in Czechoslovakia, the representatives of the four parties which could participate in militant collaboration (the Communists, Czechish and German social-democrats and the national-socialists) have a majority in the factory committees. This means that they have a majority of the factory workers behind them. If they take action jointly on the basis of militant collaboration against the employers, in defence of the interests and the rights of the working class, does not the relation of forces advance in favour of the workers? Of course it does. In such a case, bounds would be set to the growth of various yellow and fascist trade unions in the factories. If the members of these trade unions see that militant collaboration defends them, then the majority of them would leave the yellow trade unions, while as for the incorrigible strikebreakers who remain, the workers will know how to deal with them.

The four trade union bodies, namely, the Czechish trade union council, the Reichenberg trade union commission, the Czechish workers' association and the Red trade unions have more than a million members. In any case the decisive section of the working class in Czechoslovakia belongs to these organisations. The Communists propose that all these union organisations be organisationally fused, on the basis of the class struggle and working class democracy. But independent of this, how much might be done now, to-day! Thus, for instance, all the socialist and Red trade union groups could set up joint committees in each factory and town, call general meetings and conferences, and make a

solid advance in defence of the interests of the proletariat. We have already indicated how to deal in this connection with the yellow fascist plague in the factories. There can be no doubt that a majority of the workers in the factories will follow the united trade union committees. Is it not clear that in such a case the employers and their hirelings would be compelled to talk to the workers in a different tone?

In Czechoslovakia we have an army of unemployed amounting to three-quarters of a million people, and the fascists are beginning to carry on recruitment among them. Imagine that an unemployed committee of action was set up in each locality, one which could carry on its activity on the basis of powerful militant collaboration. This would make it possible to establish a powerful organisation basing itself upon the whole mass of the unemployed. Messrs. the regional police chiefs, chief constable and the fascist Lord Mayors would be compelled to completely alter their manner of speaking.

In thousands of parishes the above-mentioned four trade union bodies have their representatives in the municipal administrations, and the political organisations and other working class societies are under their influence. If militant collaboration were to be established in each municipal administration, if a local committee were set up of the representatives of all these organisations, and the poor peasants and their organisation (as, for instance, the groups of landless peasant-socialists, the groups of the "Domovina" and "Otchina" organisations, etc.) where they exist are drawn into the united front, if such tactics are applied in relation to the small handicraftsmen and the advanced intellectuals, then it will be possible to establish such a broad anti-fascist united front in every municipality which Kramarz, Strashborni, Gaida, Hennlein, Hlinka and others will attack in vain.

This, consequently, is how the militant collaboration front will develop. It would have the support of the majority of the workers in most of the factories. It would have the support of the majority of the workers organised in trade unions. The very fact of the establishment of the militant collaboration front and the action it undertakes would attract the workers of the yellow trade unions as well as the unorganised workers. Thousands of unemployed committees would rally to it, it would be followed by the million of proletarian members of the trade unions, as well as by other organised workers. The majority of the population in thousands of localities would support it. In the struggle for the interests of the small peasants and the handicraft workers, the united front could draw a big section of these groups away from the influence of the bourgeoisie, landowners, churchmen and national democrats, and make them allies of the working class.

Thus, one thing is clear. The organisation of a militant bloc of workers and peasants in all factories and in localities would lead to a fundamental alteration in the correlation of forces between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, one beneficial to the proletariat. An end would be put to the policy of retreat, and a beginning would be made of a period of counter-attack.

Your parties and leaders will perhaps ask you what you will gain if you form an alliance with the Communists and establish joint committees of militant collaboration in the factories and localities. Laws, they will tell you, are created not in the factories or localities but in parliament and the government! The gendarmes, police and army are not in the hands of the factories and municipalities, but those of the government. If, they will say, we do not stand on guard inside the government then the reactionary bourgeois parties will create new laws directed against you, and the government will set into operation against you all the means of state violence. And then, is their argument, your conditions will be worse than they are now, for then a fascist dictatorship will really come into being.

And so they stand "on guard" to prevent the adoption of laws directed against the workers and peasants? But if this is so let them be good enough, for instance, to explain to us who profits from a reduction in sick benefits, the workers or the capitalists? Or perhaps they will explain whether a reduction in unemployment benefits is of advantage to the workers. And in whose interests is an increase in the price of bread as a result of the bread monopoly? In the interests of the workers and peasants, or the speculators and landowners? And is the annulment of taxes on the rich coupled with subsidies for the banks, while the property of the peasants and the handicraftsmen are sold up by auction, also in the interests of the people? And this is called "standing on guard!"

They entered the government, they suggest, so that the state power, police, and army should not be directed against the workers and peasants. Very well! Perhaps that is why, whenever a strike takes place in Czechoslovakia the employers are arrested by the gendarmes, and the police line the strike pickets up at the factory gates? Perhaps that is why all meetings organised by the capitalists are dispersed, whereas meetings and demonstrations organised by the workers are allowed to take place without hindrance? Perhaps that is why when distraints and sales of peasants' property take place in the villages the executors of the law are often put into chains, while the property of the village poor is protected, etc.? But joking aside! The workers and peasants are well aware as to how state power is utilised in Czechoslovakia.

Finally, the "socialists" joined the government for another reason, namely, to prevent the fascist dictatorship. But WITH WHOM do they propose to do this? Who is their partner in the coalition? Not so long ago, one of them was the famous "anti-fascist," Kramarz, who has now joined forces with Strashborni. Leaving Kramarz on one side, let us take the present partners of our "fortunate" "socialists" in the government. They are the Czechish and German agrarians, and the Czechish clericals, Berran, Hodge, Malipetre, Spinna, Khaker, Stanik, Shramek and Sheinost. It is with THESE parties, and THESE people, that they wish to defend "democracy" against fascism. What is this? Illusions? Blindness? Stupidity? Criminal lightheartedness? No! This is something far worse! In any case, the socialist workers should ask the following question of their leaders and their parties: "Tell us, what sort of guarantee against fascism is the Czechish Agrarian Party which only recently was led by Strashborni, and which is now headed by his personal friends, Vranni, Berran and Stanik, the same Agrarian Party which is trying, in the person of Spinna, to find a *modus vivendi** with the fascist Hennleine? Tell us, in conclusion, what sort of a democratic fighter is the former supporter of Gaida, now a prominent propagandist in the clerical party, namely Sheinost, who is singing hymns of praise to the present regime in Austria and Spain, along with the whole reactionary clerical front? These people then, are 'anti-fascists!' So you want to prevent the advent of fascism with THEIR help? You will meet with greater success if you link up with Satan against the devil. Is not the experience of Pisek and Peshki sufficient? Do you really remain blind and deaf to the whole of the experiences undergone in Germany and Austria?"

This is one side of the "anti-fascist struggle" of the governmental socialist parties, in which the socialist workers should take an interest. But there is also another side to the picture. Your leaders and parties declare that they are carrying on an anti-fascist struggle when defending democracy. But they "defend" this democracy in the following way; they have declared a number of working class organisations illegal and are carrying on negotiations with various capitalist organisations "on equal terms." The majority of the working class meetings and demonstrations which they find inconvenient are banned by them, but they figure as honoured guests at meetings and conferences organised by the capitalists. They have issued a law regarding exceptional powers, and are overflowing with emergency decrees. They have removed the elected

* A temporary form of collaboration or compromise.—Ed.

revolutionary burgomeisters* from the municipalities, and have placed capitalists and government commissars in their places. They have taken good care that each regional chief of police should have as much power over the municipalities and the toiling population as a Turkish pasha. They have cancelled the time limits prescribed by law for the election of factory committees and municipal authorities in the districts and counties. They are quite content in a situation where no elections have taken place to the bodies managing medical funds for twenty years. We could quote ever-new examples without end, but let these be enough. We only remark that the governmental "socialists" are now preparing a law regarding the registration of parties. According to this law only those parties will be recognised as legal and allowed to participate in the elections which suit these gentlemen. In any case, the Communist Party will be prevented from participating in these elections.

The "socialist" leaders will justify themselves in the following way: "This law," they will argue, "and all the steps that the government is taking against the 'sedition-mongers' is directed not only against the Communists, but, primarily, against the fascists. You see, we have arrested not only Krasnarge, but also Gaida and Jung. We have even disbanded the Hackenkreutzers,† without disbanding the Communists. Don't you see how we are taking good care that the democratic laws are directed primarily against the fascists."

And so you have disbanded the Hackenkreutzers. But you have not touched Hennlein. You have arrested Gaida, but what could you do when he made an attack on a barracks? But you very soon released him; he got away, apparently, with four months. And this, for an attack on a barracks! How many thousands of Communists and revolutionary workers have been subjected to far severer punishment for the distribution of leaflets, for participating in meetings, for some speech, and very often for nothing at all? Gaida can carry on as previously, Jung is at liberty, while Strashborni has got linked up with the family of bankers in the "Zhivno Bank" and has thus become completely untouchable as far as the "anti-fascists" and "socialists" in the present government are concerned.

This, then, is how the "socialists" stand "on guard" in the government. They draw up laws not to benefit the workers, but against them. They utilise the power of the state not to defend the workers, but against them. They do not defend democracy, but are depriving the masses of the last remnants of their political rights. They govern along with the reactionary bourgeois parties, with the

masked fascists, and do not carry on the fight against fascism, but clear the way for open fascist dictatorship.

Is this accidental? No, when you are in Rome, do as the Romans do. Anyone who collaborates with the bourgeoisie at the present time, when the bourgeoisie as a whole is striving to bring fascism into being, must participate in the fascist process. The question of fascism will not be solved around the green table, in coalition with the bourgeoisie, but by the extra-parliamentary struggle of the toiling masses in the factories, streets, municipalities and organisations. It is only with such arguments that anything can be wrested from the bourgeoisie, and not by lackey speeches made by "socialist" ministers. Some social-democratic worker will say: "The united front and militant collaboration to repulse fascism and the capitalist offensive is splendid, but what next?" What must we reply? Approximately the following:

The united front is the BEGINNING OF THE GATHERING TOGETHER and rallying of the forces of the proletariat PRIMARILY against the menace of fascism and against any offensive on the part of the capitalists. It is the PRECONDITION for the successful repulse of all attacks made on the proletariat. At the present moment the MOST IMPORTANT AND DECISIVE QUESTION is how to set up a dam in the way of the bourgeois offensive. It is only thus that the NECESSARY PRECONDITIONS can be assured for the passage of the working class to the COUNTER-OFFENSIVE. In what way? For instance, we will not satisfy ourselves with defending the existing wages scale, but will demand an increase in wages. We shall demand better insurance against sickness, and an increase in unemployment benefits; we shall demand that hours be reduced while full wages are maintained and better protection of the householder. We are not satisfied with the relics of democratic rights which have been preserved up till now, but we shall compel the bourgeoisie by our own struggle and our own movement to give us wider possibilities and freedom of action without considering the letter of the law. We shall undertake a counter-attack on the fascist parties, and by unleashing the forces of the working class we shall draw the wavering middle elements in town and country on to our side. These elements constitute a most important reservoir for the fascist movement as long as the proletariat is weak and capitulates to the bourgeoisie. They are inclined to side with the working class and become the allies of the latter if the workers display their power and undertake the offensive against the bourgeoisie.

WILL THE UNITED FRONT OF MILITANT COLLABORATION BE ABLE TO PRODUCE THIS CHANGE IN THE GENERAL SITUATION? It will, without a doubt. But

* Mayors.

† Hackenkreutz—Swastika.

to achieve this, of course, certain preconditions are necessary.

FIRSTLY, this united front must be sufficiently broad; it must include along with the Communists, the majority of the socialist workers and their organisations, as well as the mass of the unorganised workers.

SECONDLY, it must give itself a sufficiently firm foundation organisationally, below, and must base itself on a thick network of joint commissions and organs of action of different kinds in the factories and localities.

THIRDLY, it must at least establish the basis for the unification of the trade unions. The maximum number of joint committees, consisting of various trade union groups must be established in the factories and localities.

FOURTHLY, as wide as possible a section of the socialist workers and their organisations must turn away from the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and must master the policy of the class struggle, and corresponding to the situation, must select suitable forms and methods of struggle to bring about the fulfilment of their demands.

What prevents these preconditions or the majority of them from being put into operation NOW, IMMEDIATELY? Mainly, the resistance of the leaders of the governmental socialist parties, the resistance of all those elements in these parties who under no circumstances wish to give up collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and are struggling against the united front by all possible means. How can the socialist workers overcome this resistance? Basically, BY THEMSELVES AND ALL THEIR LOCAL ORGANISATIONS CONCLUDING THE UNITED FRONT, AND A MILITANT BLOC WITH THE COMMUNISTS.

This is how matters stand and not otherwise. There is NO OTHER WAY whereby to proceed to business, and set up the PRECONDITIONS for successful defence and a counter-offensive by the proletariat, changing the present political situation in Czechoslovakia to the benefit of all sections of the toiling population.

But the Communist Party sets the working class a much higher aim than simply successful defence against the attacks of the bourgeoisie, and a counter-offensive with a view to winning back better conditions for the toilers within the bounds of capitalism. This much higher aim is THE CONQUEST OF POWER AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM.

OUR ENEMIES show us how we should not and cannot place this question. Not so long ago theses were published by the TROTSKYISTS in France. The theses, by the way, deal with the united front in France. The question is raised as to what aim the united front should follow in France. The Trotskyists reply that the aim of the united front in France is the conquest of power. How do the Trotskyists understand this question of power. As "a government of socialists and communists," as "a BLUM AND CACHIN MINISTRY."

The very fact of such a setting of the question shows that the authors are in the bog of social-democratic parliamentary combinations and demo-

cratic illusions up to the chin. What would such a ministry (Blum-Cachin) really be? How could it achieve power? With the aid of the ballot? With the aid of parliamentary combinations and agreements? But that is the theory of Blum. But what would such a ministry base itself on? On parliament and the old bourgeois state apparatus? This apparently is how Blum imagines things. What programme could such a ministry put forward? The same kind as was operated in Germany by Ebert, Noske and Scheidemann in the year 1918? As both "Labour Governments" operated in England? As the "socialist Messiah" De Man proposes and as the "socialist" ministerialists are operating in Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Denmark? It is clear that only Blum can imagine such a government. In the best of cases it would be but a coalition government, even though without direct representatives of the bourgeois party, yet nonetheless a government within the bounds of capitalism, a government in which some or other socialists, it is true, bedeck the ministerial seats, but where the real power remains in the hands of the capitalists. We have already seen dozens of such "socialist" governments, and what has been their fate? Has it not been proved with incontrovertible clarity by the experience of historical development that they have nothing in common with the real conquest of power by the working class.

REAL working class power means Soviets, means an armed working class, the disarming of the bourgeoisie, and the expropriation of the landowners, manufacturers and bankers—in a word, is the DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT. And the working class can only achieve this real working class power through a VIOLENT revolution, and by overthrowing capitalist domination through proletarian revolution. This is also proven by the whole process of historical development with unfailing clarity. A "workers' and peasants'" government WITHOUT revolution, WITHOUT soviets, WITHOUT an armed proletariat, WITHOUT the disarming of the bourgeoisie, who are deprived of all political and economic power, and WITHOUT a united revolutionary programme, theory and practice, has NOTHING IN COMMON WITH OUR IDEAS REGARDING REAL WORKING CLASS POWER, WHICH CAN ONLY BE THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT. To set the question of power in Trotsky fashion and solve it so, means to play the game of the social-democratic theorists. To follow such a path means only to strengthen those democratic illusions in the minds of the masses, without overcoming which the proletariat cannot and never will really win power.

If we have been convinced that the capitalist will not voluntarily raise wages even by one per cent., and will not give the working class even the most

insignificant political rights, then common sense should tell us that the bourgeoisie will be still less inclined to voluntarily give up their MAIN weapon, namely, POWER and the private property in the means of production connected with it. The bourgeoisie must BE COMPELLED to give this up and, of course, not with the aid of the ballot, but with THE AID OF FORCE, with THE AID OF REVOLUTION. This is a most important law.

And from the point of view of this law we ask the following: Is the united front or the militant collaboration described above and proposed by the Communists sufficient for the conquest of power? Obviously not. Trenches can be stormed with hand grenades, but heavy artillery is necessary to storm fortresses. The enemy's army can be weakened, disorganised, demoralised and even compelled to retreat by separate assaults and operations on the part of partisan detachments, each one of which to a greater or lesser degree is operating at its own risk. But to destroy the enemy army and be victorious not in one battle alone, but in the war as a whole, this requires a UNITED army, a UNITED LEADERSHIP, UNITED strategy and tactics, and a UNITED aim. To win a revolution is a far more difficult task than to win a war. It is more difficult because the process of FORMING SUCH UNITY OF AIM, STRATEGY AND TACTICS IN THE CLASS STRUGGLE, AS WELL AS UNITY OF LEADERSHIP takes place in quite different circumstances than in the general staff of an army. The dynamics of the class struggle are such that revolutionary unity is hammered out only in THE PROCESS OF STRUGGLE, on the basis of the experience of the masses.

It is, of course, impossible to foresee how the class struggle will develop in Czechoslovakia in all its details. One thing, however, is clear. Its previous development has brought about a situation where the majority of the socialist workers feel deeply dissatisfied with the policy pursued by their parties. This has evoked a broad movement in favour OF CHANGING this policy. We Communists point out the DIRECT form and line to be taken by this alteration. Our slogans are first and foremost the following: "Down with collaboration with the bourgeoisie! Long live the united front, and militant collaboration between socialists and Communists!" We say the following to the socialist workers: "If your parties were really socialist parties they could and should bring about this change." But the leading bodies of these parties are opposing this by all possible means. We therefore tell the socialist workers and their organisations: "Don't wait, but bring about this change yourselves." By this means and also by independently conducting the struggle, we will show the socialist workers in a practical way how to approach the united front and

militant collaboration, and at the same time indicate the means of struggle, the extra-parliamentary mass struggle and the direct aims of the struggle, against fascism and the capitalist offensive. If this struggle develops to its full extent then it will sharpen to a tremendous degree. In the process of accumulating their own experience of struggle, in the process of our untiring agitation and propaganda of our Communist aims, theory, strategy and tactics, the POLITICAL LEVEL OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS MUST UNCONDITIONALLY INCREASE, so also must the POLITICAL LEVEL OF THE STRUGGLE. But Stiven threatens the socialist workers with the following: "If," he says, "you conclude a united front with the Communists, then perhaps the bourgeoisie will get scared at the beginning, but then everything will turn out as it did in Austria." By this Stiven wishes to say that if the workers resort to arms, they will undoubtedly be defeated. But if the socialist workers of Czechoslovakia follow the example of the socialist workers in Austria and Spain, and resort to arms in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, then they will thereby be leaving the basic kernel of the social-democratic doctrine and will be approaching the Communist doctrine.

And if the armed struggle in Austria and the armed uprising in Spain did not bring about victory to the proletariat, the main reason is that the social-democratic workers have not adopted the position of the Communists on all basic questions. In other words, the example of Austria and Spain by no means implies that the workers must be defeated if they resort to arms, as the social-democrats assert in order to scare their members. For the October Revolution of 1917 and the fruits of its victory, namely, the Soviet Union, bear witness to this with the most unquestionable clarity. But this means that the workers CANNOT BE VICTORIOUS if the majority of them adhere to the position taken up by social-democracy ON EVEN ONE IMPORTANT QUESTION.

Let us clear this up by a few words. You can fight for one or other economic demand while remaining a social-democrat (it is clear, not the social-democratic type of minister-socialist who robs the workers of their benefits). You can also fight against fascism, yet be a social-democrat (it is clear, not a social-democrat of the Derer type who arrests anti-fascists). You can also fight for political rights (it is clear, not as a social-democrat of the Meissner type who deprives workers of their political rights). You can even, as the example of Austria and Spain shows, advance to the barricades without having yet broken with social-democracy (but then it is clear you should not have anything in common with Stiven and others, with those who have shot down the workers on more than one occasion). But if you wish to be victorious and to really conquer

power, you can only do so UNDER THE BANNER OF COMMUNISM, ONLY UNDER THE BANNER OF THE TEACHINGS OF LENIN.

On the question of the oppressed nations, the C.P. of Czechoslovakia has adopted a correct position. For these nations it demands the right to self-determination to the point of separation. At the same time, it declares with full clarity that it is against any unification with Hitler, Pilsudski and Horthy, and that it will carry on an active struggle against this, as is now being done in the Saar region. Without a doubt the first part of our programme in respect to the oppressed nations (self-determination to the point of separation) is not fully understood by the great masses of the Czechish petty-bourgeoisie and the majority of the Czechish socialist workers. The explanation is the fear of these sections of the population for Czechish national independence. The social-democrats make use of this fear to train heavy artillery on us, they honour us with such epithets as "traitors to the fatherland," "Hitler's assistants," they assert that we "wish to blow the republic into bits," etc. Have we foundations of a political and ideological character for remaining on the defensive on the question of the oppressed nations? By no means. How must we reply to the Czechish chauvinist demagogues? Approximately in the following way:—

"Don't get so hot, gentlemen! Don't you know that the slogan about the rights of nations to self-determination to the point of separation is not a Bolshevik invention? Do you know that it was a slogan of the bourgeois revolution, and is consequently a democratic slogan? So that, if you were real and consistent bourgeois-democrats, you should yourselves put this slogan into operation. But since you do not belong to this category, then the consistent operation of this principle will evidently have to be one of the tasks facing the proletarian revolution. This is the first point.

"Secondly, have you heard of the comparisons to which Lenin resorted when explaining this question? He said that the right to divorce is not equal to divorce itself. Let us develop this example. What must a husband do or not do if he does not want his wife to leave him? He must not beat or persecute her, nor compel her to go hungry, must not give her unbearable burdens, but allow her such rights as he has himself. In a word, he must treat her as an equal, behave as one comrade to another. Then he will have no need to fear that his wife will leave him. But how do you behave in connection with your marriage, fastened on you, by the way, to the NON-CZECHISH PEOPLES? It is not worth while speaking about that. And then you are surprised that they would like to get rid of you? If you would behave otherwise, they would not strive to part from you.

But your "democratism" is insufficient for the solution of such questions. This is why the proletarian revolution will have to solve this question instead of you.

"And finally, have you people who still call yourselves 'Marxists' completely forgotten the famous declaration made by Marx that no people can be free that oppresses other peoples? We Czechish Communists have not forgotten it, and act according to this principle. It is just because we wish the toiling Czechish masses to be free, i.e., that they should rid themselves of the shame and chains of capitalism, that we say that it is in their own interests not to oppress other nations.

What must we tell the masses of Czechish workers? Send all the patriotic blatherers who are in the pay of the "Zhivno Bank" and the friends of General Petchek, to the devil. In every nation and consequently in the Czechish nation, there are two nations, namely the nation of the rich and the nation of the poor. The nation of the masters always made a noise about "national freedom" and "national unity," when it was a question of "freely" skinning and robbing this second nation, the nation of the poor and the slaves. But as soon as these slaves raise themselves so as to rid themselves of the chains placed around them by their "brethren," and as soon as these gentlemen feel themselves seriously threatened they always link up with their "age-long enemies."

Remember your own history. With whom did the Czechish masters unite against the "orphans" when they were threatened by the Hussite revolution? With Rome! Take the history of other nations. With whom did the French bourgeoisie form an alliance against the Paris Commune? With Bismarck, although it was he who at that time held more than half of French territory under his iron heel. Who prepared the advance of the imperial German army on Petrograd in 1917 in order to smash the fortress of the revolution? The Russian bourgeoisie. It was only the victory of the Bolsheviks that hindered this criminal plan. But let us return to our own history. Who applauded the imperial general Vindishgetz in the year 1848, when he shot down the students of Prague and the toiling masses? The Czechish bourgeoisie. Who was it that out of fear not of the proletarian revolution, but of the bourgeois-democratic revolution which was at that time shaking Europe, hid himself under the skirt of the autocratic Hapsburgs? Who was it at that time who played the role of gendarme of reaction and covered the Czechish people with the most terrible shame? The Czechish bourgeoisie, who declared that: "If Austria had not existed we should have had to set it up." Yes, that is the kind of class which rules over us, Czechish workers, intellec-

tuals, peasants and handicraft workers. It is a class without honour, a cowardly class, but a fierce one, which from the very first day of its birth was branded with the mark of Cain, with the mark of treachery to everything that is great, advanced and revolutionary, to everything that can make a people great. This is the class of Mervash, and Zhevicha.*

And this class wishes to turn you against the Communists who wish to show the world that the Czechish people not only has its Prague "society of masters," not only its admirers of Vindishgetz, not only its Zhevichas, but also its "orphans," its peasants from Klum and its barricade fighters of

* Mervash and Zhevicha were pre-war Czechish politicians who occupied important positions, but who were later exposed as spies and informers.—Ed.

Troitsy of the year 1848. They turn you against us because we wish the Czechish proletariat to carry the struggle of their forefathers to its end, and that the nation should thus liberate itself from the domination of capital and become really free.

Look at the Soviet Union. There you see a live example of how the emancipation of the toiling nations, the path indicated by the Bolsheviks, leads not to the loss of national freedom, by the nation which was formerly the ruling nation, but on the contrary, leads to the strengthening of its national liberty, and provides the final guarantee for the freedom, thanks to its fraternal alliance with other nations. And the Soviet Union, as far as we are concerned, serves also as an example as to how the national problem should be settled in Czechoslovakia.

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRAMME OF THE BRITISH UNION OF FASCISTS

By McILHONE.

THE question of the development of the united front of the working class in the struggle against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war, is now the most outstanding in the British working class movement. Undoubtedly the events in Germany and Austria have had a tremendous effect on the British workers, helping them to realise the urgent need to defend themselves and their organisations against fascism. The united front movement in resistance to fascism in France, in Spain, etc., has encouraged the British workers to strive to find ways and means to strengthen the unity of action and fighting capacity of their own ranks. The recent municipal election results, where the workers voted in large masses against the representatives of conservatism and the National Government expressed once more the hostility of the masses of workers to the National Government. But the Labour Party gained from this, and succeeded in winning over 600 new seats.

At the same time, however, inside the Labour Party and trades unions there is a strong opposition growing against the splitting and disruptive policy of the Trades Union Congress and Labour Party leadership, who are campaigning against the united front and against the Communists inside the trades unions. A series of mass demonstrations and actions of the workers have been carried through, on the basis of the united front, against the measures with which the National Government are preparing for greater repression of the

working class, against the Sedition Bill and Unemployment Bill, both of which represent big steps by the National Government in the direction of fascism. During the three years of the National Government, besides the Sedition and Unemployment Bills, the police force have been reorganised and concentrated under the Home Office. Workers' demonstrations are met with a terrific mobilisation of police, the use of aeroplanes and the autogyro are common. The police protection of the fascists on the streets is supplemented by customary light treatment in the capitalist courts when arrested for brutal attacks on workers. Altogether, taking the record and daily activity of the National Government into consideration, it is clear that it is the means by which finance capital is carrying through its policy at the present time, and the main avenue for fascisation. The British bourgeoisie lose no opportunity, and leave no possibility out of consideration which may be of use to them in their struggle against the working class. Therefore, the perspectives for the united front in Britain against the National Government are very favourable.

The ruling class in Britain, taking all circumstances into account, and utilising the National Government to carry through their reactionary plans against the working class, do not forget that it may be necessary for them to lean on some extra-parliamentary force. Such a force is the Mosley fascist movement. But the Mosley fascists can only play such a rôle for the British bourgeoisie

in so far as they can create a mass basis for themselves among the workers, farmers and petty-bourgeoisie. The Mosley fascists, by their extensive demagoguery, elaborate parades and meetings, their endeavour to play upon the discontent of the workers, farmers, agricultural labourers and small traders, and efforts to spread aggressive nationalistic ideas among the toiling population, purpose at the present time to sow discord, disunity, confusion, and provocation among the masses. The increased activity of the fascists this year coincided with the bringing forward by the National Government of its Bills on Unemployment and Sedition.

Olympia.

The movement of the workers against the Mosley Blackshirts grew in an ever-enlarging degree with the call of the C.P. at Olympia in June, where the Blackshirts displayed the greatest brutality against the anti-fascists, culminating in the Hyde Park demonstration of 100,000 London workers against Mosley, on September 9. The August Central Committee of the C.P. warned the workers that:

"There is still widespread confusion on the issues of fascism in Britain. On the one hand there is a tendency to see the issue as only the issue of Mosley and the Blackshirts, and not to see the main weight of the fascist offensive, which is being directly conducted by the National Government. On the other hand, there is the tendency to emphasise solely the fascist offensive of the National Government and to treat the Blackshirt movement as a politically negligible factor. Both tendencies are incorrect. Finance capital at present backs the National Government as its main weapon for fascisation, like Bruening 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."

All the measures of the National Government towards mobilising the state apparatus against the working class, together with the facilities (in the form of financial support, police protection, press propaganda, approbation in the capitalist courts, etc.), which are being given to Mosley, have the one aim. This is to increase the attacks on the elementary rights of the workers, their exploitation and plunder. It is to rob the farmers and petty-bourgeoisie, and transfer the burdens of the economic crisis on to the workers' backs.

The Communist Party carried on a wide campaign for the united front against the Mosley fascists. It drew in workers' organisations with growing success. Trades union branches, Labour Parties, and especially Trades Councils, the centres of working class organisations in the most important towns joined in. Round the Trades Councils which have organised anti-fascist conferences and demonstrations (Manchester, Bradford,

Liverpool, etc.), the anti-fascist movement has extended into the trades union branches and Labour Parties. While continuing boldly and firmly to mobilise the workers for actions against the Mosley Blackshirts, the Party must also carefully study the methods of agitation and propaganda of the fascists. It must reply patiently to their demagoguery, and expose them as the worst enemies of the workers, protecting the interests of the most reactionary section of the big capitalists. They must be unmasked as the people who are organising to destroy the workers' organisations. They seek to take away every possibility of defence against worsened exploitation away from the workers. They aim at placing the whole toiling population under a reign of terror, and at the mercy of the capitalists in the so-called "corporate state."

The British Union of Fascists, under the vain and haughty autocrat, Mosley, have their own peculiar methods of propaganda and agitation. In common with those of all fascists, they have learned well the art of demagoguery and provocation.

The British working class freed itself from the bonds of Liberalism at the end of the last century. True, this was expressed in the organisation of the Independent Labour Party and Labour Party, whose "socialism" was not up to much. Nevertheless, the idea of socialism has spread extensively throughout the working class since the beginning of the century, becoming more popular with the Revolution in Russia, and the world-shaking victories of the Soviet Union.

Fascists on Capitalism.

The fascists bear this in mind. Since they cannot pass the question of socialism by, they find it necessary to give an answer as to where they stand on the question of socialism or capitalism. To this they reply:—

"(1) Capitalism is freedom for owners of capital to use it as they wish, irrespective of the results for other owners of capital or the general community.

(2) Fascism retains the benefits of privately-controlled capital and private enterprises; and although it lays down definite limits within which capital might operate, it restricts its freedom only when it is being utilised against the economic well-being of the State and community."

Capitalism is here pictured as a system where, if the "owners of capital" are allowed too much freedom they will conflict with other owners of capital and the "community." Socialism is pictured here as a system where State control and ownership of the means of production result in "bureaucratic and untechnical" interference with the processes of private business. Of course, such a characterisation has nothing in common with reality. Capitalism is a system distinguished by the fact that all the means of production are in the hands of the capitalists, while the workers own nothing but their

ability to labour. Socialism implies the overthrow and defeat of the capitalists and the taking over of the means of production by the workers with their own class power, directing production to the use of the millions of toilers. By presenting fascism as an alternative to these two, the fascists want to appear as "critics" of capitalism. All the time, in reality, they not only defend capitalism, but defend and carry through the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist and most imperialist sections of finance-capital.

Even in the formulation quoted, if we decipher it on the basis of arguments given later, the idea of the necessity for completely subordinating capital in general to monopoly capital, i.e., the weaker capitalists to the ruling monopolist clique is already expressed. This idea finds its clearest expression in fascism. Fascism neither can, nor desires, to propose any new system. When Mosley speaks of the new "corporate system," it is the same kind of blather as that uttered by Mussolini and Hitler regarding the corporate system. Just as they, Mosley has no intention of establishing a new system, but only proposes to increase the oppression of the old capitalist system to the extreme. That fascism has no new system to offer is explained also by Captain R. Gordon Cumming in the *Blackshirt*:

"Communism will accept nothing from the capitalist state. The Communist demands its complete and ruthless annihilation. Fascism, on the other hand, accepts the good and sound fabrics of capitalism, employing these together with the principles and material of fascism.

To that extent fascism is a prolongation of the capitalist system as the Communist claims."

But that fascism is a "prolongation" of the capitalist system is in itself only partly true. The whole truth is that it is a "prolongation" in a much worse form, where, with the workers' organisations broken up, and the workers themselves hounded into compulsory fascist organisations and slave camps, the capitalist system itself is "prolonged" only by the use of the most open, cruel, savage terror against the workers and their leaders, and more intensified exploitation in the factories, mills and mines. Mosley himself tells us what are the "sound fabrics" of capitalism which will be "accepted" by the fascist state:

"In the Corporate State you will be left in possession of your businesses." (Open Letter to Businessmen, *Fascist Week*, 1/2/34.)

"The making of profit will not only be permitted, but encouraged." (*Greater Britain*, page 85.)

Fascism will leave the businessman untouched. The making of profit will be "encouraged." We must explain this to the workers, showing capitalism as it is, with the intense speeding up in the factories and mines, with the low wages, unemployment and continual struggle to live, with the hunger and despair which is stalking the "derelict

areas" to-day in Britain, explain that this is what the fascists wish to "prolong." But it is more than this. To-day, even in the conditions of mass exploitation, mass suffering and oppression, the workers in Britain still have a means of defence. The capitalists own the means of production, they own the army, the airplanes, the police force. In their hands they have the means to crush into subjection the working class, if these workers were without defence. We know only too well how these same weapons are so callously used to shed the blood and fire the homes of the Indian and other colonial peoples who dare to resist the rule of British imperialism. To-day in the rail depôt, in the pit, at the docks, on the trams, in the engineering shops, the sole possession of the workers with which to defend their conditions and fight for improvements, is their organisations, their trades unions, factory and shop organisation, their freedom to come together openly in assembly and organisation. The workers' organisations exist to defend them from that which the fascists stand for, namely, the "encouragement of profit making." The whole dastardly purpose of the fascists is to deprive the workers of the power of defence, to curtail every democratic right, to crush their organisation, to annihilate especially the revolutionary vanguard of the workers, the Communists, and to destroy the labour and trade union officials in so far as they resist their attacks. Look at the concentration camps and the thousands of unnamed graves in Germany, Austria and Italy; look at the heroic efforts of the German workers to-day, struggling in conditions of a fierce terror and strict illegality, to build once more the once powerful free trade unions smashed by the fascists. In Mosley's fascist Corporate State he intends to repeat this experience in Britain. Take, for example, what he said to the South Wales miners:

"Fascism would immediately realise the demands of the miners for a National Wage Agreement, as every corporation will be required to regulate the relations of employer and worker in this manner. The working day would also be fixed upon generous terms from pithead to pithead, making allowance for the unpleasant, arduous and dangerous nature of the work." (*Blackshirt*, July 27th, 1934.)

It is true that the miners want a National Wage Agreement, but with increased and not reduced wages, and every miner, especially in South Wales, knows that it is useless to hope for a National Agreement with increased wages unless this demand is backed up by the whole forces of the miners' trade union organisation. That the fascists would provide a "National Agreement" may be true, but it would be an "agreement" which would be "regulated" by the fascist "corporation," in which the capitalists will participate as rulers, acting under the control of the representatives of the arch-reactionary fascist government. The "en-

couragement" of profit-making would certainly mean that the miner would be compelled to accept even worse conditions, and would be unable to resist as freely as to-day precisely because under Mosley's fascism (as under Hitler), there would be no trade union organisation. The miners can easily understand what conditions would be like without the means of defence, without the trade union organisation. Conditions are bad enough to-day, but under fascism, under compulsory agreements, with no trade unions, no means of organised, open resistance, the present misery in the coal-fields would be worsened endlessly. And what does Mosley propose to do with the trade unions?

Mosley and Trades Unions.

"The machine" (the trade union movement) "which cost so much in blood, imprisonment, sorrow, victimisation and poverty, has now ceased to be the property of the workers, and is now merely the vehicle for a few trade union bosses to carry them into the political arena and to cabinet rank, salary and perquisites." (*Blackshirt*, July 27th, 1934.)

"Fascism does not seek to destroy trade unionism, but to free it from political control and the suicidal system of strikes." (*Blackshirt*.)

The cunning and unscrupulous attempt of the Blackshirts to appear as the defenders of the trade unions against the careerist trade union bureaucrats will be decisively repulsed by all trade union workers. It is necessary to repel this impudent interloper in the most vigorous way. Under the flag of clearing the trade unions of the reformist leaders, which the Communists have so often and justly criticised, the fascists wish to destroy the trade unions themselves. Mosley wants to free the unions "from political control and the suicidal system of strikes." So did Hitler and Mussolini, and how did they achieve this? They closed down the trade unions, seized their funds, imprisoned the leaders (freeing only such as the German social-democrat Wels, who went over to the fascists), closed down the trade union press, and compelled the workers to join the newly-created "fascist unions," unions controlled from top to bottom by fascists, with compulsory acceptance of the capitalists' demands as their main principle. Imagine the Amalgamated Engineers' Union "transformed" and the officials in the head and district offices wearing Blackshirts! We, as workers, must defend our trade unions, smash every attempt of the fascists to penetrate them; build up the unions on the basis of the class struggle, on the basis of a united class front of the toilers against the capitalists. We know that this will bring us into opposition to the will of the leaders, but such a struggle against a policy of class-collaboration will strengthen our unions and fit them better to defend our conditions. Mosley wants to destroy the trade unions, to prohibit

strikes, because he is a vile enemy of the working class, and because the trade unions are a hindrance to the increased exploitation of the workers.

What the Union of Fascists intend to do with the trade unions they will do, if given the opportunity, with all other working class organisations. Let the seven million members of the British Co-operatives ponder the meaning of these words:

"No one wished to destroy the Co-operative Societies, and certainly the Blackshirt Movement had no such intentions. But they were determined to end the misuse of legitimate trading concerns for the private ambitions of a few socialists." (*Blackshirt*, June 1st, 1934.)

And here, under the flag of struggle against "malpractices of the co-operatives in the private interests of a handful of socialists," it is intended that the co-operatives are placed at the service of the "legal" private interest of the capitalists.

This is nothing else than a declaration that the Co-operative Movement under fascism will not be permitted to exist as a part of the Labour Movement, but will be "reorganised" in the same way as the trade unions, its funds, buildings, shops, property, will be taken over by the fascists, and the whole system of co-operation as we know it today, will no longer exist.

The Blackshirts summarise their views on the social problems in the following manner:

"The modern economic problem is one of distribution, the problems of production having been solved; we are faced with the fact that millions of our fellow countrymen and women are going short of necessities, not to say the AMENITIES of life, not because we have not enough food, warmth and shelter for everyone, but because we have not the purchasing power to buy the goods modern industry can produce in superabundance. British fascism will remedy this discrepancy between producing power and consuming power by increasing purchasing power." (Mr. Linham, *Blackshirt*, June 22nd.)

All that is stated here is a conscious deception of the workers. The modern economic problem is not one of the absence of correct "distribution," but is the existence of the capitalist mode of production from which there inevitably follows such distribution that the rich grow richer, and the poor grow poorer. There is no "distribution" in general, and "production" in general, independent of a definite social system. If everything depended on distribution, then, of course, the capitalists would easily cope with the crisis and might maintain their power endlessly, "distributing" the surplus store they have accumulated more correctly. But everybody knows that the capitalists have no such ideas. Under capitalist conditions, under the conditions of the capitalist mode of production, distribution is determined by the fact that the means of production belong to the capitalists. Under the capitalist mode of production, commodities are produced not for the benefit of the population, not to be "distributed" in general, but so that surplus value may be received, so that profits may

be received, and the profits realised on the market. And when the market becomes glutted, and the railway sidings, warehouses, the wharves and pit tops can hold no more, the pits and mills are closed, men are dismissed, millions of pounds of perfectly good food and material go to waste, because there is no "market" to ensure the capitalist his profit. In the Soviet Union, where the workers are in power, everything is produced for use. There is no surplus lying idle in warehouses. Food, clothing, etc., are brought from factory to shop to be sold immediately. To try to get rid of their accumulated stocks, the capitalists cut wages, making it less possible for the masses to buy, thus increasing their poverty. In the Soviet Union, as goods become more plentiful, there is no possibility of a glut; the wages of the workers rise to meet the growing production of goods. The fascists make the lying assertion that it is all allegedly a question of distribution, to divert the attention of the workers from the main thing. This is the fact that the only way whereby they can save themselves from poverty, is to destroy the capitalist mode of production and expropriate the means of production from the capitalists.

That the fascists are lying is shown clearly enough by the experience of Germany where, utilising much the same demagoguery of high wages, increased purchasing power, etc., as Mosley repeats now, Hitler proceeded at once, when in power, to carry through a policy of wage reductions and increased prices, which has reduced the purchasing power of the workers considerably.

The fascists fight to save capitalism, to save the profits of the ruling class, and to maintain the system of production and accumulation of wealth, on one hand, and mass poverty, hunger and want on the other, but in a worse form. To gain the ear of the workers with their demagogic proposals for increased wages, improved conditions, etc., the fascists devote considerable attention to the actual problems facing the different sections of the toiling population. The fascists allegedly not only demand improved conditions in general ("a high wage policy is not only sound justice but sound economics"—*Blackshirt*), but approach each section of the workers on the basis of their existing grievances. This we have seen already with the miners. Here is what they say about the South Wales coal industry:—

"South Wales depends largely on Dominion exports. *Blackshirt* policy would by reason of the increased industrial activity (sic) under the Corporate system, so increase our demands for raw materials from the great Dominions, that in return they would take more of our products, such as South Wales coal in return."

By what means the fascists will succeed in bringing about "increased industrial activity" under the Corporate State it is somewhat difficult to discover.

If, however, one were to judge from the results of the fascist state in Germany, which has led to a reduction both of imports and exports, under fascism in Britain, which depends so much on exports, the results would be still more deplorable.

To the dockers they promise:

"The guaranteeing to each man a fair share of work, and to the employer a fair share of labour; to abolish the disgraceful 'fight for work' to be seen daily on the docks; to register all dock labour. . . to institute a policy of 'one day's start—one day's pay'."

The fascists promise the British seamen to:

"Exclude entirely foreign seamen from British ships, to permit Lascars on British ships sailing in tropical waters, to arrange on all ships adequate accommodation, hygienic sanitary arrangements, and to make generous maintenance compulsory." (*Blackshirt*, August 31, 1934.)

It is perhaps sufficient commentary on these lying promises to read in the following issue of the *Blackshirt* on September 7, that:

"The leading directors of the fishing and shipping industries at Brightlingsea invited the officer in charge of Home Counties East, Lieutenant-Colonel Croches, to meet them at a conference held on Saturday."

Evidently the shipping bosses are well aware of the nature of Mosley's promises.

Mosley and the Unemployed.

The fascists understand that if they are to compel the workers to listen to their demagoguery, they must first know what conditions each section of workers are living and working under, what their grievances are, and how to formulate demands for them, so as to catch them with their bait. This makes this type of fascism all the more dangerous.

To the unemployed Mosley paints a picture in which even his demagoguery cannot conceal the background of "labour armies" and "concentration camps":—

"Under fascism the unemployed will be treated as they should be treated, as organised 'reserve workers' on a proper wage level." (*Blackshirt*, June 29, 1934.)

With "private enterprise" and "business" and "profits," Mosley has in mind, too, the retention of the unemployed under the "Corporate State." Hitler would not disagree that he treats the unemployed of Germany "as they should be treated," and gives them "a proper wage level."

Fascism is a product of monopoly capitalism in the period of the crisis of capitalism. But the fascists cannot carry through the policy of monopoly capitalism unless it has a mass basis. It is the business of the fascists in the interests of monopoly capitalism, in the interests of maintaining its rule, to build its mass basis precisely among those elements who have been ruined and impoverished by the big combines and the capitalist crisis, small producers, traders, peasantry, intellectuals, professional classes and declassed elements. To reach these strata the fascists resort to the most varied demagoguery, extending this to

the working class, attempting to utilise the discontent of the workers with capitalism, not hesitating to combine this with "radical" phraseology. Comrade Manuilsky, at the Eleventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I., brilliantly analysing the question of fascism, explained this common trait of fascism which now is a characteristic feature also of the Mosleyites:

"In order to retain this following of extremely fluid and motley elements, and in order to recruit certain strata of the working class to its side, fascism must resort to crude demagogy, a combination of the wildest reactionary demands with quasi-socialist phraseology. The existence of the Soviet Union, which ushered in the new era of the proletarian revolution and the growth of the revolutionary temper among the working masses, compels fascism to adapt itself to the spirit of the times, to call the masses to 'revolution' against prostituted bourgeois democracy." (Manuilsky: Eleventh Plenum Report.)*

The Blackshirts, recognising that the National Government is an unpopular one, do not hesitate to don the garb of critic of the government, usually condemning its "incompetency" and "ineffectiveness" in tackling the problems before the "country." And no less does Mosley hesitate, when need arises, to speak and write about the sins of the bankers:

"Capitalism is in the melting-pot, not because of the persistent and frontal attacks of the socialists, but because it has been betrayed by the financiers."

"If it is admitted that industry has passed through a period of depression . . . what explanation is forthcoming . . . that throughout the same period the Big Five collectively have consistently declared an annual average profit of £10,000,000 . . . we have the finest system of banking in the world . . . for the bankers." (Cecil Palmer, *Black shirt*, June 1, 1934.)

But such declarations are generally accompanied by propaganda accusing everyone but the British capitalists of being responsible for the situation in Britain. So, to attempt to draw the attention of the workers, farmers and petty-bourgeoisie away from their own British capitalists and bankers, the fascists declare:—

"The British working-class must learn to realise that the international financiers are responsible for the present industrial stagnation and consequent poverty and not the master industrialists who suffer from the same disease." (*Blackshirt*, August 24, 1934.)

The fascists try to draw the attention of the masses away from their own capitalists by a sinister propaganda against the Jews. They attempt to create the impression that the present situation in the capitalist world is caused by some kind of international plotting and scheming by a "Jewry hostile to the community":

"The finance of the world is controlled by the Jews. 'No one, no country, no people can fight against money,' said the Jews.

'We will take away your credit,' said the Jews. 'We will smash you through the columns of the capitalist press,' said the Jews.

And Hitler, tightening his lips, said in effect, Shoot!" (*Blackshirt*.)

The attempt to divert the hatred of the masses of the people from their own exploiters by slandering the Jews is the usual method long used by all the most reactionary cliques in the capitalist countries. Tsarism and its loyal flunkies, the Black Hundreds, attempted to drown the revolution by pogroms directed against the Jews. The Denikin and Petlura Whiteguards did the same kind of thing during the civil war in Soviet Russia, while Pilsudski, and especially Hitler, have done and continue to do the same thing now. Mosley is also following in their footsteps.

The Jews.

No. Not some "international gang" of Jewish "plotters" is responsible for the exploitation and privation of the British working class. Only our own capitalists and financiers (whether blue-blooded Britishers or Jews) are responsible for the robbery and plunder of the people. Only our own capitalists (irrespective of their race or religion) can be held responsible for the fact that during the twelve months, when the conditions of the workers worsened, from June, 1933, to June, 1934, the aggregate profits of twelve companies showed an increase of £17 million, or that eighty-nine companies in the course of the last year increased their profits by 40 per cent., representing the results of the intensification of the exploitation of the workers in factories and mills.

The position of the small traders and shopkeepers under the pressure of the banks and multiple stores has been steadily worsening. Their discontent increases as they feel themselves being crushed out by their more wealthy and better organised opponents. All this discontent and hostility is a field where fascism can sow the seeds of its vile anti-working class poison, if not counteracted by the revolutionary movement, with systematic explanation to the small traders and other sections of the petty-bourgeoisie, that their future lies only in going forward together with the working class to socialism:

"We cannot afford to lose the personal service of the small trader, who is a stabilising element of immeasurable value to the social and economic life of the nation." (*Blackshirt*, June 29, 1934.)

"Under fascism the position of the small shopkeeper must not only be maintained but improved . . . They should not be crushed out by the operation of the soulless machine with great accumulations of capital, controlled by a few hands . . ." (*Blackshirt*, June 1, 1934.)

The first of these two quotations clearly exposes the side from which fascism is interested in the fate of the petty-bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeoisie interest the fascists not as ruined sections of the population, but as sections saturated with private-property instincts, who to that extent can

* *The C.P.s and the Crisis of Capitalism.* Modern Books, Ltd.

become an anchor wherewith to save capitalism—"an eternally stabilising element in the social economical life of the nation." We, Communists, are also interested in the fate of the petty-bourgeoisie, but from a directly opposite angle. We are interested in the petty-bourgeoisie, as a part of the population which has been brought to ruin by capitalism, and which to that extent is capable of passing over to the side of the working-class, and becoming the latter's ally.

The Small Man.

The position of the small trader under capitalism is a very precarious one. As the big multiple stores arise and spread, the small traders find themselves being steadily crushed out by the competition of stores able to buy goods in huge quantities, allowing them to sell off cheaper. In many cases the multiple stores and big shops are directly connected with the factories, the same firm controlling the product "from factory to shop." Under such circumstances the property of the small man becomes mortgaged to the banks. In his effort to keep going, he resorts to borrowing on the value of his stock. Most of the small shopkeepers are situated in working-class areas, away from the big central streets, where high rents, rates and taxes make these streets the exclusive property of the big company stores. The small shopkeeper is forced into the back streets, to where the impoverished workers live, feels himself close to them, but is, nevertheless, ideologically bound to the law of "private property." The fascists attempt to keep the small trader as a "stabilising element" of capitalism in their propaganda and promise that the fascist state will protect them against the "soulless machine" of the multiple store. Hitler, Mosley's prototype, also developed this propaganda, but since his advent to power, the big stores remain untouched. The working class alone will take over the multiple stores from the capitalists.

In the interests of "sound business," capitalism seizes the best creations of the brains of man and either uses them for intensifying exploitation, or speeding up preparations for the unspeakable horrors of war, or simply buys up these inventions and scraps them. To the inventors Mosley demagogically declares:

"The unfortunate inventor is entirely at the mercy of the private financiers or the big industrial combines . . . On no account would a Blackshirt Government permit the purchase of valuable patents by vested interests and their entire suppression." (*Blackshirt*, June 8, 1934.)

But fascism cannot solve this question in England, because, as in Germany and Italy, fascism is the government of finance capital, of the big industrialists and combines, in whose hands are the means of production, who pay the wage-bill

and who equally, as in any "democratic" country, subject the inventions and new projects created by man to the domination of profit-making. Because capitalism has been destroyed in the Soviet Union, and the means of production are in the hands of the workers, the talented organisers of production are given full scope to their abilities, as invention is used in the U.S.S.R. to increase the well-being and comfort of the toiling masses.

In the Lancashire textile area there is mass unemployment, low wages and widespread poverty. In some villages in Lancashire, due to the closing of the mills, as high as 80 per cent., 70 per cent. and 60 per cent. of the insured population have been registered as unemployed. The capitalists carry on a continuous offensive against the workers' wages, and have been trying for several years to spread a more loom per weaver system throughout Lancashire. The proposal to scrap some 16,000,000 spindles to concentrate on the best mills is now being discussed. This will considerably worsen the conditions of many thousands of textile workers. The Lancashire capitalists blame foreign competitors, especially Japan, for the tragic situation of Lancashire textiles, in an attempt to shelve their own responsibilities. The exporters of capital, who draw high tribute from investments abroad, have been further enriched by the exploitation of the Indian masses, especially in the cotton mills. British capitalism alone is responsible for this situation, where the impoverished masses of Indian textile workers are played off against their class brothers in Lancashire. Soviet Power in Britain, throwing out the capitalists, carrying through a reorganisation of the textile industry, trading on an equal basis with a freed India, will alone be capable of restoring life and hope to the Lancashire workers. What does Mosley propose?

"Exclusion of foreign goods from the Crown Colonies. This would give employment to 11,000 textile workers.

The removal of tariff barriers in India against Lancashire. This would give work to 25,000 men and women in Lancashire.

The exclusion of Japanese textile goods from India, giving work to 29,000 workers, a total of 65,000.

To compel the Indian millowners to give their workers a decent standard of living and to gut and rebuild the foul industrial slums of the East." (Sir Oswald Mosley, at Southport, on July 25, 1934.)

Exclude Foreign Foodstuffs!?

Britain, with only 36 per cent. of the total imports into the Crown Colonies, cannot take steps against these "foreign" countries, including such "foreign" countries as India and the Dominions, from whom the Crown Colonies buy more than 60 per cent. of their total purchases, without retaliatory measures being taken by the U.S.A., Japan, and Canada and other Empire countries

against Britain. This would result in a sharp increase of the danger of war — unfavourably for Britain. The proposal that a fascist government remove the tariff barriers in India (which at present are 25 per cent.) on the cotton imports and excludes Japanese goods also encounters certain “difficulties.” For example, the British bourgeoisie were compelled to agree to the raising of the duty on cotton imports to 25 per cent. as a concession to the Indian bourgeoisie to win them for support for their policy of suppressing the mass Independence movement. The Lancashire capitalists, to meet Japanese competition, are striving to force the standard of living of the Lancashire textile workers down to that of the Japanese. Mosley wants to destroy the Textile Unions, to introduce compulsory agreements, and take away the right to strike, for these are a barrier to the realisation of the demands of Lancashire capital.

The British capitalists are not at all keen on driving the Indian bourgeoisie into an anti-British movement, because of the effect this would have in stirring up the mass anti-imperialist movement, which might end seriously for Britain. There is another consideration. The development of Japanese trading in India may affect Lancashire trade quite a bit, but the British ruling class have other factors to consider. For example, its policy in regard to Japanese aggression in Manchuria, the need to keep Japan as an ally and base for operations in the Far East against the U.S.S.R. Mosley’s proposal means in reality that the fascist government would take steps in India to destroy the entire anti-imperialist movement. To carry out his proposals would mean to place the whole country under a reign of terror, unprecedented even for India, to suppress even the Indian bourgeoisie and to turn the country into a gigantic concentration camp. The task of the British workers is to prevent this from happening, to fight for the independence of India and the colonies against British Imperialism. The principal political slogan of the fascists is “Britain first.” Under this jingo-chauvinist war-cry they carry the National Government policy of economic nationalism a step further, spreading their agitation especially among the farmers, upon whom he (Mosley) concentrates as a favourable field of growth. To the farmers and agricultural labourers he declares:

“We stand definitely and uncompromisingly for the exclusion of the £220,000,000 worth of foreign foodstuffs which come annually into this country. The production of that amount in our own country would raise our present food production to £500,000,000 a year, a thing which the Blackshirts will successfully accomplish in a Three Years Plan.”

Would it be possible for the Blackshirts to carry

out this ambitious programme? The National Government has already taken a series of steps to “protect” the British food producers, through tariffs, subsidies, and Quota regulations. Everyone knows the unlimited aid the governments have given from time to time to create a sugar beet industry. Thirty million pounds have been spent in subsidies, and the net value of the sugar produced from British beet in 1933-34 was £2 million. The Government is paying half the price paid to the growers on every ton. A subsidy of £3 million was recently granted to beet producers. Schemes have been created for milk and bacon. Milk has gone up in price, the restriction of bacon imports has resulted in a drop in the consumption of bacon among the workers, who cannot pay the high price of the home produce. Britain is the biggest meat importer, and the granting of the subsidy is a concession to the big stock raisers in Britain, but it does not solve anything, because the meat problem is a difficult one for the National Government. The bulk of the meat imports come from the Dominions, especially Australia, and also from the Argentine. The much boosted Ottawa agreement gave some privileges to the Dominions, but the total results of the two years’ extensive campaign by the National Government for the development of trade within the Empire has been that Empire exports to Britain have increased by 6 per cent., while British exports to Empire countries have increased by 2 per cent. Food agreements exist also with Denmark and the Argentine, which Britain cannot break without serious effects on its own exports and investments. Generally, the British bourgeoisie are in a muddle over the question, as for example, in the words of the *Economist*, it is estimated

“that more than half of the national income from overseas investments, amounting in normal times to some £250 million, comes from countries whose economies would be violently damaged by the restriction of food imports by Great Britain . . .” (August 11, 1934.)

Mosley’s programme would hit the Empire countries. Australia sent in 1933, 92 per cent. of its exported butter, 43 per cent. of its exported wheat, 19 per cent. of its exported flour, and 80 per cent. of its exported beef, to the United Kingdom. South Africa would be involved, as she sent to Britain in 1933 67 per cent. of her exported foodstuffs. Canada, who sent in 1933 to Britain 55 per cent. of her total exports of vegetable and agricultural products, and 60 per cent. of her animal and animal produce, is also interested. Here are just a few of the difficulties making the idea of Britain becoming an economic unit impossible under the conditions of capitalism. We merely mention the fact that to secure arable land and facilities for the rapid development of agri-

culture and stock-raising in Britain we must first throw out the landlords, take over the idle sports land and give it to the farmers and agricultural labourers to cultivate. Mosley himself owns quite a large patch of land, and naturally is not inclined to expropriate himself. Mosley is cruelly deceiving the small farmers and agricultural labourers. It is necessary for the Communist Party to mobilise these sections in the struggle against the landlords and the big capitalists. It must explain that only when the land is in the hands of the workers' state, with large-scale cultivation and highly-developed mechanical methods, would it be possible to transform the backward agricultural regions, bring all the land into use, and extend Britain's food supply base considerably.

"We Want a Striking Force"!

The national-chauvinist policy of Mosley is a war policy. He knows that British capitalism cannot get markets unless in a struggle with foreign competitors on a war basis. The whole purpose of his "Britain First" propaganda and campaign against the Jews, is to stir up division among the working class, to conceal the responsibility of the British capitalists and spread the war spirit.

"If we are to maintain our position as the leading nation of the world, it is surely essential that we become a nation of airmen, as we were once the premier sea-faring nation in the past." (*Blackshirt*, September 7, 1934.)

"We want first and foremost a striking force large enough and fast enough to deal an effective blow at the main centres of population and industry of any European country with which we may conceivably find ourselves at war, and this force must always be on a war footing. Besides this, we must have other squadrons to act with the army and navy to guard our sea-borne trade in home waters and at many points abroad and to protect our foreign garrisons." (*Blackshirt*, July 13, 1934.)

This is one of the main purposes aimed at by the demagogic programme of the British Union of Fascists. Finance capital in Britain is preparing to make the one last desperate plunge to improve its position. It is true that it is taking every step to war very carefully, by forming alliances, provoking conflicts, and making agreements. It tries to make sure beforehand that Britain will emerge a victor, while supplying large funds to building up the machinery which will deluge the world in the blood of the toiling people. Mosley not only fits in with this scheme by propaganda, but by training a special flying squad. Unscrupulous to the last degree, the fascists are not above using the decent and honest anti-war feelings of the masses to serve their own purposes, by attempting to place the blame for the last war on the "politicians" and conceal the responsibility of the capitalists. The *Blackshirt* says:—

"Where are the houses you promised the people, you decrepit democrats? We demand in anger and scorn, where are they? You sorry cheats. You and your kind

have ruled the world. You all worship the same idol, you pay tribute to the gods that you have set up, and in the name of liberty, you stand by while men and women suffer the anguish of physical and spiritual starvation." (*Blackshirt*, on Twentieth Anniversary of World War, August 3, 1934.)

The anti-semitic propaganda of the Blackshirts, as a demagogic cover for the struggle against socialism, has grown considerably and become more open since the development of the anti-fascist counter-actions against them. Mosley himself described the anti-fascists at Olympia in the following terms:—

"Organised gangs armed with razors, knives, iron spokes, and every weapon known to the Ghettoes of humanity, hirelings of Moscow finance, carrying weapons never seen before the Ghettoes were emptied on these shores."

At Hyde Park, on September 9th, Mosley declared:

"From Baldwin to Pollitt, the united front against fascism stretches unbroken . . . Behind the Communist and socialist mob is the Jewish financier supplying the 'palm oil' to make them well."

Burn the Books.

The success of the anti-fascist movement in uniting Jewish and Gentile workers is a guarantee that Mosley will not achieve his object, and the cause of the furious hatred with which his words are spoken. The experiences of fascism in Germany and Austria have aroused the deepest feeling of horror and detestation in the minds of honest British intellectuals and professional circles, who are gathering into the anti-fascist front in increasing numbers. The *Blackshirt* speaks openly of its hatred for all forms of democracy, but to mention the word "culture" is to rouse their deepest fury. Democracy, culture, liberty of thought and organisation are to Mosley a "hateful poison comparable to the destroying terror of the plague."

"I suggest," says G. E. M. Burgh, in *Blackshirt* of August 3, 1934, "without the least desire to horrify my readers, that our first duty to culture is to destroy it. I know that this meets broadside the allegation of our enemies that fascism is barbaric, ruthless and brutal. If we have to choose between barbarism and decadence, I choose barbarism without hesitation."

Burgh evidently knows something of Goering's methods and no doubt envies him. Perhaps he, too, dreams of the day when the rich libraries of London in the British Museum and other places will make a fine bonfire in Trafalgar Square.

The Labour Research Department has published an excellent little pamphlet which, among other things, gives the ancestral background of Mosley and his family, going back to the sixteenth century. We read there how in the seventeenth century, Sir Nicholas Mosley attempted to enclose land at Collyhurst, near Manchester, but the inhabitants of the town resisted the attempt. In 1629 the Mosley family were charged in Parlia-

ment with "oppression, injustice and vexation." Seven years later Mosley used threats against the inhabitants of Uttoxeter to compel them to consent to the enclosures, which were ultimately "carried into effect by force." In the early part of the nineteenth century, Sir Oswald Mosley, Baronet, and his stewards issued the following proclamation:

"Oyez! Oyez! Oyez!

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY, Baronet, Lord of this Manor of Manchester, in his Majesty's name, strictly charges and commands all manner of persons, not to wear any Swords, Staves, Knives, Falchions, or any other unlawful weapons, but that they and every one of them, by aiding and assisting to the Borough-Reeve and Constables and all other officers, in suppressing all Routs, Riots, Tumults and other unlawful Assemblies, during the time in which this Fair has its continuance, on pain of Penalties set down by the Statutes in such case and provided.

God Save the King!

Sir Oswald Mosley, Bart., the Stewards, the Borough-Reeve and Constables of this most ancient Town and Borough of Manchester.

God Save the King!"

One can be sure that history knows of many examples where this proud, aristocratic family, in their contemptuous loftiness from the common

people, would treat the lowly workers, artisans and serfs who would dare to resist the enactment of the laws of the Mosley family, with their fair share of "blood, imprisonment, sorrow, victimisation and poverty." The ideological campaign of the fascists must receive more attention from the British Party at the same time as the workers are mobilised to drive them off the streets. While utilising the experiences of the workers in Germany and Austria, to explain what fascism means in practice, it is also necessary to reply to the fascist propaganda by developing the united front of struggle. The Thirteenth Congress of the Party, meeting in February, 1935, will have before it a popularly written draft programme of Soviet Power in Britain. This programme will answer the concrete question for the workers, farmers, intellectuals and professional classes as to what a Soviet Government can give in Britain. This will show to each section of workers and petty-bourgeoisie, that Soviet Power alone, with the capitalists overthrown, can reconstruct the economic, social and cultural life of Britain. Only in this way, by the development of the mass united anti-fascist front, against the National Government and the Mosley fascists, will be destroyed any possibility of fascism coming to power in Britain. Only by rallying the working masses round the banners of Communism in the course of the struggle will it be possible to go forward to the proletarian revolution and the building of Socialism.

"PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION MOVEMENT."

THE REPORT OF PIATNITSKY (Secretary, E.C.C.I.)
Supplement to No. 22.

NOW ISSUED IN PAMPHLET FORM - Id.

Obtainable from
WORKERS' BOOKSHOP, 34 CLERKENWELL GREEN, E.C.1.

THE ZINOVIEV OPPOSITION AND ITS COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY SCUM

By B. PONOMAROV.

THE whole of the Soviet Union and the entire proletarian world are burning with a unanimous hatred of the fascist scum of the Zinoviev anti-Party group and the men who nurtured these scoundrels, creating the counter-revolutionary "ideology" for the fascist murderers.

Wide circles of the members of the C.P.S.U. know that the Zinoviev opposition was formed in the period between the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Congresses of the C.P.S.U. The history of the Zinoviev anti-Party line has its roots in the far more distant past.

The opportunist position of Kamenev on the question of imperialism during the time when he was beginning to lean to Hilferding is well known. No less known is his shameful role during the trial of the Bolshevik fraction in the Duma, when he, "from fear," ignominiously disclaimed the consistently revolutionary line of the Bolsheviks. At that time Comrade Lenin branded his conduct in the central organ of the Bolsheviks—the "Social Democrat"—as one unworthy of a revolutionary. A recently published letter of Lenin to Zinoviev shows to what extent Lenin exposed the double-faced policy of Zinoviev in 1916. The question under consideration at that time was that of the necessity of publishing an independent theoretical Party organ—"A Symposium of Social-Democracy"—in place of the "Communist" in which Bukharin and others participated with the intention of expressing their anti-Marxist views.

"At the present time the position of the Party and the international situation is such," wrote Comrade Lenin, "that the Central Committee must continue to proceed independently, not binding its hands either in Russian or in international affairs."

Zinoviev, together with Shliapnikov, was in fact carrying out another policy behind the back of Lenin. Considering it necessary to bring about an agreement on the publication of "The Communist," they concealed the vacillations of Bukharin, enabling him to establish fractional connections both in Russia and abroad.

Zinoviev signed a letter to the Bukharin group (at Lenin's request) in the name of the editorial board of the Central Party newspaper to the effect that the editorial board refuses to participate in the "Communist," because the Leninist "Social-Democrat" could not and did not want to assume responsibility for such co-editors, and because their "attitude to the cause was a non-Party one."*

At the same time, however, Zinoviev was in correspondence with Shliapnikov behind Lenin's back, advising him to exert pressure upon Lenin to obtain concessions from him. Lenin at that time exposed these machinations of Zinoviev, and qualified his conduct as a "renunciation of our entire policy."

"When the letter was written," said Lenin . . . "It was your direct and unconditional duty at that time to make a forceful attack on the editors, to break away from them for ever and to bend all efforts in order to prove to Alexander the impossibility of having anything to do with these gentlemen as with editors of a leading magazine.

"Instead you propose to capitulate to them, to renounce all conditions and to take back from the editorial office of the Central Party newspaper the letter which you signed personally. And this—under the pretext that 'it does not pay to treat them seriously': as a matter of fact you propose that YOUR policy is not to be taken seriously, you are reducing to nothing the letter of the editorial board, you are denying your own self, and are giving the publishers the right to conclude, that the editorial office of the Central Party newspaper was being STUBBORN!

"These are already more than vacillations, these are vacillations in the third degree, which are turning into something much worse."

. . . "Do you know," continues Lenin, "that at Kienthal Radek wanted to gain a majority against us among the Lefts at their deliberation, utilising Frölich, Robmanch and others, and that an ULTIMATUM was necessary to compel him to recognise the INDEPENDENCE of our Central Committee. What other 'game' will people play when the question arises as to the attitude to Junius (this question has already arisen as to the 'mechanical separation' from the Kautskyites, etc.!) Do you GUARANTEE that there will be none? If there is any such 'game,' it will be tantamount to a renunciation on your part of our entire policy. If not, then it is foolish, after all that, to bind our hands on the editorial board of our leading journal. I shall never agree to this insane policy. This is my final decision.†

Subsequent history proved that it became a profession for Zinoviev "to repudiate himself" and his statements; and fool the Party as he fooled Lenin. Moreover, both Zinoviev and Kamenev inculcated the same policy into their group and educated the opposition cadres in the same spirit.

The whole opportunist line of the opposition is very clearly linked with the position of Zinoviev and Kamenev in the days of the October Revolution. At that time they were against the October uprising and the socialist revolution in Russia, basing themselves on the premise that the Bolshevik Party could not and must not take power into its hands, because the country was not yet prepared for a transition to

* Letter of V. I. Lenin to G. E. Zinoviev. *Proletarian Revolution*, No. 4, 1934, pp. 76-77.

* Letter of V. I. Lenin to G. E. Zinoviev, *Proletarian Revolution*, No. 4, 1934.

† *Ibid.*, p. 78.

socialism. In this question they were LEANING FULLY to the position of the Second International. While Lenin, Stalin and the Central Committee of the Party were calling the working class to struggle to overthrow the capitalist system, Kamenev and Zinoviev proposed to create a government consisting of all so-called socialist parties, i.e., they proposed to include in it side by side with the Bolsheviks, the worst enemies of the proletariat—the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who were fully exposed as servants of the bourgeoisie at that time. Zinoviev and Kamenev were the only ones of the whole membership of the Central Committee against the armed uprising in October. Moreover, they came out in a semi-Menshevik newspaper against the decisions of the Party, THEREBY REVEALING THE DECISION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON THE PREPARATION OF THE UPRISING TO THE ENEMY.

Lenin's Demand for Expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

"Kamenev and Zinoviev betrayed to Rodzianko and Kerensky the decision of the Central Committee of their Party regarding the armed uprising and as to concealing from the enemy the preparations for that uprising," . . . wrote Lenin. "This is a fact. This is a fact which cannot be denied by any subterfuges. By their underhand lie to the capitalists, two members of the Central Committee BETRAYED the decision of the workers to them. There can and must be only one reply to this; namely, the following immediate decision of the C.C.

"Recognising the complete strikebreaking character of the conduct of Kamenev and Zinoviev in appearing in the pages of the non-Party press, the C.C. expels them from the Party.*"

"Strikebreakers"—was the ignominious nickname with which they entered the history of the great October Revolution.

In appraising their position in the period of October, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"At that time they directly stated that by raising an insurrection we were heading for ruin, that it was necessary to await the Constituent Assembly, that the conditions for Socialism had not matured, and would not mature so very soon. Trotsky proceeded from the same premises when he was for the insurrection. He made the direct statement that if a victorious proletarian revolution in the West did not speed up its support in the more or less immediate future, it would be foolish to think that Revolutionary Russia would be able to hold out against Conservative Europe . . ."

"This is why Trotsky and Kamenev and Zinoviev found a common language in the tenth year of the October Revolution."†

Not stopping at the struggle against the uprising before the victory of the October Revolution, these "strikebreakers" came out against Lenin again, in the period when power was already in the hands of the proletarian dictatorship. Again they strove to establish a coalition government and found the support of a number of other opportunists in this

question. This position signified a surrender of the power already won to the reformists and conciliators, to the bourgeoisie. In place of Lenin, who was at the head of the first Council of People's Commissaries, they proposed to appoint bourgeois myrmidons, the worst enemies of the proletariat—Avksentyev or Chernov.

For his opportunist line at that time Kamenev was removed from the post of Chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets.

In the period preparatory to the Fourteenth Congress of the Party the Zinoviev opposition undertook a broad offensive against the Party along the whole front. It was in that period that Zinoviev and Kamenev COMPOSED their opportunist theories and platform and GIRDED themselves for struggle against the Central Committee. All the preparations for the XXII Leningrad conference were carried on in the same spirit. In Leningrad, where Zinoviev worked at that time, fractional meetings were practised on a wide scale for the propaganda of the Zinoviev platform and the "cultivation" of adherents. At these conferences criticism of the line and work of the Central Committee was developed and anti-Leninist theories worked out on the most important questions of Party policy. Thus, the adherents of Zinoviev characterised our economic system as state capitalism and considered the New Economic Policy as a complete retreat. Lenin pointed out, at the time when the N.E.P. was introduced, that it was a temporary retreat on the part of the Party to enable it to re-group the forces of the proletarian dictatorship and launch a new attack against the capitalist elements, to build socialism in our country, but Zinoviev radically distorted this Leninist TEACHING.

"The N.E.P. is a retreat," wrote Zinoviev. "When the proletariat revolution matures in other countries and the proletariat of the West comes to our aid then we shall again launch an attack. In the meantime it is nothing but a breathing spell."

This formulation would have unquestionably brought the Soviet Union, the first country of the dictatorship, of the proletariat, to defeat. Therefore, all enterprises in the Soviet Union which Lenin called "consistently socialist enterprises" and which form the fortress of our socialist economy, were characterised by the opposition as "state capitalism." It is clear that state capitalist undertakings and their growth cannot lead to socialism, and that there is no need to struggle for them—such was the direct conclusion to be drawn from this defeatist Zinoviev outlook.

The assertions of Kamenev and Zinoviev regarding our relations with the peasantry were closely bound with this anti-Party line. Zinoviev wrote openly that the Party must carry through a policy of neutralising the middle peasant. While the Party, strictly

* Lenin, Vol. XXI., p. 355.

† Political report to the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.

adhering to the postulates of Lenin on the relations with the peasantry, considered that it WAS BUILDING SOCIALISM IN ALLIANCE WITH THE MIDDLE PEASANT, basing itself on the poor peasants and fighting against the kulaks, the opposition was against the alliance with the middle peasants. Despite the perfectly clear statements of Lenin at the Tenth Congress of the Party on the policy of an alliance with the middle peasants, the adherents of Zinoviev slanderously maintained that Lenin was for neutralising the middle peasants under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, the Zinovievites were against the basic strategic slogan of Lenin on the peasant question. Kamenev and Zinoviev began to exaggerate the danger of the kulak to the point of panic to "intimidate" the Party and the working class, and compel the Party to give up the policy it was carrying through with regard to the peasantry. By juggling with obviously false figures they maintained that the kulak had gained control of two-thirds of the grain. In an attempt to discredit the line of the Central Committee, create panic in the ranks of the Party and achieve the carrying through of his opportunist line, Kamenev shouted that the "central figure" of the village was not the middle peasant, but the kulak, and that the kulaks had "flooded" all the lower rural organs.

The opposition put forward a clearly Menshevik demand with regard to the structure of the Party. In their desire to pose as the defenders of the proletariat and the proletarian composition of the Party, the Zinovievites demagogically demanded that the ranks of the Party be increased by the time of the next Congress to the extent of 90 per cent. of the Party membership being industrial workers working at the bench. This demand signified that the Party was to increase its ranks in the course of one year by 4 to 5 million new members, i.e., by almost the whole working population of the Soviet Union at that time. This policy, once carried through, would have violated all the traditions of Bolshevism, destroyed the distinction between the Party as the vanguard of the proletariat, and the non-Party masses, and dissolved the Party in the class bringing about the loss of its leadership and the weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Opposition Passes Over to Menshevism.

The demand of the opposition regarding admission to the Party was clearly directed against the line taken by Lenin on this question in March, 1922. In his letter to Comrade Molotov "On the Conditions of Admission of New Members to the Party" Lenin clearly emphasised, at that time, the extreme crudity of the opportunist mistakes of Zinoviev on the question of admission to the Party.

"I consider it extremely important," wrote Lenin, "to lengthen the probationary period for admission of new

members to the Party. Zinoviev defines the probationary period as six months for workers and one year for all others. I propose to leave half a year only in the case of those workers who were actively engaged as such in major industrial enterprises for not less than ten years. To establish one-and-a-half years for other workers, two years for peasants and Red Army men and three years for all others. Exceptions to be made in case of joint permission from the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

"I consider it very dangerous to leave the short terms proposed by Zinoviev, without a change!"

Thus the opposition took the errors of Zinoviev for its platform and not the directives of Lenin. We see that Zinoviev took the first chance to drag out his opportunist viewpoints on admission to the Party, views exposed by Lenin, and formulated them in opposition to the Party.

When organising their adherents before the Fourteenth Congress of the Party and propagating distorted theories on state capitalism, on the N.E.P., etc., the Zinoviev opposition did not shrink from the vilest and most slanderous assertions. Following in the footsteps of Zinoviev, his nearest comrade-in-arms, P. Zalutsky, who was at that time secretary of the Leningrad Regional committee, spread the slander of "the degeneration" of the Party, and of a "Thermidor," attempting in this manner to create the ground for a struggle against the Central Committee, and presenting the opposition as a defender of the revolutionary line. At that time, however, the whole essence of their anti-Leninist views indicated WHO was really degenerating and slipping down ever further into the camp of the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The views and slogans advanced by the opposition at that period, disguised by "Left" phrases, but essentially Menshevik, reflected the pressure of the petty-bourgeois elements on our Party, and the tendency of that element to turn the development of the land of the proletariat dictatorship along the capitalist path.

In all the preparations for the Fourteenth Congress which the Zinovievites carried through they calculated on including in the Leningrad Committee a group of adherents of the opposition, picked beforehand, and to arrange a similar delegation to the Congress. In order to carry through their plan the oppositionists openly threatened those leading Party workers of the Leningrad organisation who were not in agreement with the Zinoviev line, and had them finally removed both from the delegation and the Leningrad committee. All the leading organs of the Leningrad Party organisation (section committees, regional committee) were constituted by selecting the adherents of the opposition.

The Zinovievites did not make an open declaration to the masses, however, of the Leningrad Party organisation of their struggle against the Party line, and the fact that they had hand-picked a delegation

which was against the Central Committee, etc. All the attacks against the C.C. were conducted for the time being within narrow groups of those in opposition. The masses of Party members were told of the necessity of intensifying the struggle against Trotskyism, and waging a struggle against the errors of the Bukharin group and that the basic task of the Leningrad organisation was the struggle for Leninism and watchfulness with regard to the growing kulak element in the village, etc. This was conscious deception of the Party organisation, and it was only with the help of this deception that the opposition was able to secure a majority in the Leningrad organisation for a short time.

The oppositionists concealed their preparations for an attack upon the line of the Party and the organisation of their group on a definite platform from the Central Committee. The whole "work" of the Zinovievites was done secretly, behind the back of the Central Committee and was, therefore, of a particularly corrupt and anti-Bolshevik character. It educated cadres who became accustomed to declaring their solidarity with the line of the Party in words, but prepared to stab it in the back and attack it in deeds. The whole activity of the Zinoviev opposition was an example of double-dealing. It pointed the way for all anti-Party elements, it gave an example of a secret, underground anti-Party struggle concealed for the time being by talk of unity. The Zinoviev opposition was the mother of the double-dealing groups which were formed later and led a struggle against the Party.

The Zinoviev opposition paid particular attention to the "cultivation" of the Komsomol (Young Communist League.—ED.) by attempting to inculcate its opportunist viewpoints there. With this in view the Zinovievites attempted to win over the Central Committee of the Young Communist League to their side, through the representatives of the Leningrad regional committee of the Y.C.L. These attempts ended in failure. The Leningrad Regional Committee of the Y.C.L. then attempted to call what was almost an All-Russian conference of the Komsomol in Leningrad under the protection and direction of the Zinoviev centre, but without the knowledge of the Central Committee. The basic task of this conference was a mobilisation of forces for the struggle against the line of the Party. Here the Zinovievites wanted to conduct opposition propaganda and spread their opportunist viewpoints behind the backs of the Central Committee, and calculated that it would be easier to speculate among the youth on the alleged "Leftism" of their slogans, on the struggle against Trotsky, on equality, and on attracting to the Party 90 per cent. of the workers, etc.

The undermining work of the oppositionists was

exposed by the Central Committee, which forbade the calling of this conference and proposed that those who were preparing it be removed from leading positions.

Disastrous Anti-Party Theories in Leningrad Y.C.L.

The corrupting ideological and organisational work of the opposition among the Komsomol bore its fruit in that the most confirmed opportunists and enemies of the Party were reared from the ranks of Komsomol workers of Leningrad. A whole theory was created to the effect that "the Party leadership alone cannot assure that the proletarian core of the League plays a leading role in the Young Communist League." This was a direct appeal to distrust the Party leadership and to elaborate their own political line which, independently of the Party, would have to ensure that the "proletarian core played a leading role." Theories such as that "the Komsomol is more revolutionary than the Party," and that "the youth in general must be more to the Left than the Party, were also developed there. Such theories, together with systematic anti-Party work in the ranks of the Leningrad Young Communist League, which nurtured distrust in the Leninist leadership of the Central Committee and the general line of the Party, brought their results and led quite soon to an unheard-of onslaught against the Party. A motion calling for the "recognition of the decisions of the Fourteenth Party Congress as correct" was defeated at a session of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the Young Communist League, AFTER the Fourteenth Congress of the Party. This was something unheard of in the whole history of the Komsomol. At the time when all the Party organisations were unanimously greeting the decisions of the Congress, the leadership of the Leningrad Komsomol accepted an anti-Party resolution.

Such were the fruits of that political corruption in the spirit of which the Zinovievites educated the members of the Komsomol.

It is perfectly clear that the POLITICAL GUILT for this decision as well as for all the other activities of the enemies of the Party, who came from the ranks of the Leningrad Komsomol at that period, must be placed on the "new opposition" and its Zinoviev-Kamenev leadership.

At the Fourteenth Party Congress the opposition advanced their own reporter—Zinoviev, as against Comrade Stalin, the reporter for the Central Committee, thereby showing clearly to the whole Party that all the talk of the opposition regarding the unity of the ranks of the Party was nothing but hypocrisy and deception. In fact, it was an open step to a split in the Party. The platform of the Zinoviev opposition was brought fully into the open and

exposed at the Fourteenth Party Congress and at the Fifteenth Party Conference.

THE FOUNDATION OF ITS WHOLE POLITICAL LINE WAS THE DENIAL OF THE POSSIBILITY OF BUILDING SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY. In summing up for the Fifteenth Conference the results of the struggle Comrade Stalin wrote :

"In my opinion a lack of faith in the upbuilding of socialism is the basic error of the new opposition. I call it a basic error, because all the other mistakes of the new opposition are grounded on it. The mistakes of the new opposition in the matter of the New Economic Policy, State capitalism, the nature of our socialist industry, the function of co-operation under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the best way of fighting the kulaks, the rôle and the importance of the middle peasants—all these mistakes are the outcome of the one primary blunder, they all depend upon a lack of faith in the establishment of a socialised society by the forces of our own country." (Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I., p. 64.)

In organising the masses of the working class and the toiling peasantry to carry through the current tasks of socialist construction, the Party took the unshakability of the Leninist theory regarding the possibility of the victory of socialism first of all in one country, regarding the possibility of building a complete socialist society in the Soviet Union as its starting point. This teaching was at the basis of the entire general line of the Party. As far back as the years of the imperialist war, in 1915, Lenin formulated and proved this theory. Already at that time Lenin exposed and crushed Trotsky, who opposed this doctrine. In the period of the struggle for the socialist revolution in Russia, from February to October, Lenin and Stalin took as their starting point in the entire work in preparation for the October revolution the possibility of the victory of socialism in Russia, and waged an irreconcilable struggle against the opportunists of the Kamenev, Rykov and Preobrajensky type, who attempted to deny this theory.

The Leninist teaching on the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country lies at the basis of the entire policy of the Communist Party. After the transition to N.E.P. in 1922-23, and not long before his death, Lenin wrote that the Soviet Union has "everything that is necessary and sufficient" for the building of a full socialist society. He emphasised that "a socialist Russia will emerge out of N.E.P. Russia."

The Zinoviev opposition came out against these fundamental directives of Lenin, they opposed the basic principle which is serving as a guiding line for the entire policy of the Party in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, as well as for the whole of the practical work of the construction of socialism.

Zinoviev and Kamenev made, on the eve of the Fourteenth Conference, at one of the sessions of the Politbureau, the assertion that "the Party will not

be in a position to cope with the inner difficulties on account of the technical and economic backwardness of our country, if the international revolution does not save us." In his book, entitled "Leninism," Zinoviev, in defining the N.E.P., preached the same idea. Both at the Congress and the Conference the opposition came forward with an extensive elaboration of this anti-Party and anti-Leninist theory, and attacks upon the teaching regarding the possibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union. It retained this position during the entire course of its struggle.

We must emphasise that the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country assumed exceptional political significance during the period under review. The Party had just lost its founder and leader—Comrade Lenin. It was at the time of the most difficult crisis in the development of the first country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In characterising this period and comparing it with the eve of October, Comrade Stalin said : "Then, in 1917, it was a question of effecting the transition from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat. Now, in 1925, it is a question of effecting a transition from present-day economy, which cannot be called socialist as a whole, to socialist economy, to an economy which must serve as the material basis of socialist society." (Stalin, *The October Revolution*, p. 130.)

Opposition Speculates on Soviet Difficulties.

This was the period when the delay in the development of the world proletarian revolution became clearly defined, and the partial stabilisation of capitalism set in. In connection therewith the following question arose : does not this stabilisation lead to the weakening or destruction of the possibility of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union ? This was also the period when the Party restored industry, liquidated economic disorder and began the reconstruction of the entire national economy along the lines of the new economic policy. In connection therewith the question arose as to whether the N.E.P. would not weaken the possibility of constructing socialism in the Soviet Union.

Due to these factors the problem of the perspectives of our revolution arose before the Party with a particular sharpness. YOU CANNOT BUILD properly without knowing the aim for which you are building, pointed out Comrade Stalin in proving the tremendous significance of the theory of the possibility of constructing socialism at first in one country. He said :

"Are we building in order to fertilise the ground for bourgeois democracy, or are we building in order to construct Socialist society? This is now the root question of our mode of construction. Have we the possibility of constructing Socialist economy now, under the conditions of N.E.P., under the conditions of the partial stabilisation of capitalism? This is one of the most important questions that confronts our Party and Soviet work." (Stenographic Report of the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

The Party replied to this question in the affirmative. The opposition denied the possibility of creating a socialist society in the Soviet Union. In their numerous speeches, platforms and underground agitation during these years of struggle the opposition attacked this theory in every possible way, declaring it to be "a theory of national narrow-mindedness," "a break with Marxism," etc.

It is a great merit of Comrade Stalin that, under the extremely complicated conditions of that period, he was able to estimate and show the Party the great political significance of this Leninist doctrine, that he defended it in the struggle against the opposition and developed it further. Stalin inspired the working class with the idea of the possibility of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. Otherwise it would not have been possible to mobilise the forces of the proletariat for the struggle for those victories of socialist construction which are now amazing the entire world.

The question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union was (and is now) a programmatic question which defined the general line of the C.P.S.U., the line of the whole development of the land of the proletarian dictatorship. When the opposition opposed the Party on this question they passed over to the viewpoint of the Mensheviks.

In preaching a lack of faith in the victory of socialism in one country, the Zinoviev opposition went over fully to Trotskyism and became an ardent defender of the Trotskyite theory and the Trotskyite attacks on Leninism. It occupied a Trotskyite position on all the basic questions of theory and tactics of the Party. At the same time the organic union of both groups took place on the ideological basis of Trotskyism. The leaders of both of these groups granted each other an amnesty.

"We declare," said Zinoviev, at the Plenum of the Central Committee in 1926, "that now there can be no doubt but that the basic kernel of the opposition of 1923 issued a correct warning of the danger of a move away from the proletarian line and of the threatening growth of the régime of the Party apparatus."

The same was done by Trotsky, who declared that he was incorrect in his criticism of the errors of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

It is sufficient to recall what the adherents of Zinoviev said not so long before this about Trotsky, who had now become the "leader" of the united Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition, to estimate the full meaning of the above declarations which testified to the opposition's complete lack of political principles. Kamenev then declared that:

"No sooner does the Party meet with any obstacles, no sooner is it necessary for the Party to turn the rudder, no sooner does Comrade Trotsky attempt to parade before the Party in the rôle of saviour and teacher, than he

always indicates the incorrect road, because he has failed to master Bolshevism on the basic questions . . .

"The Party knew and became ever more convinced on the basis of experience that to act ACCORDING TO TROTSKY MEANS to substitute Trotskyism for Bolshevism." (Emphasis mine—B.P.)*

Zinoviev claimed the same, after making dozens of declarations a few months prior to the creation of the united Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition, at meetings of the Party organisations of Leningrad, about the need "to intensify the struggle against Trotskyism."

The real value of their words was soon clearly revealed. Men, who only a short while previously swore on a stack of Bibles that they were the implacable foes of Trotskyism and would always wage a struggle against this anti-Leninist tendency, took up Trotskyism as their weapon and made it their banner in the struggle against the Party. The Zinoviev opposition jumped straight into the camp of those bitterest enemies of Leninism, who had fought for many years against the Party. This "flight" was an indication of the lack of principles, an indication of the unheard-of degradation of the opposition.

The adherents of Zinoviev gave an example of a policy which sticks at nothing in the attempt to corrupt the ranks of the Party, and the struggle against the leadership of the Party headed by the great unshakable Stalin, who stood tirelessly, and with iron endurance in defence of the cause of Lenin.

By its activity the Zinoviev opposition cleared the way for Trotskyism to carry on its subsequent struggle; its leaders, as Comrade Stalin put it, acted as "Trotsky's road-sweepers, who cleared the road for him." Having merged with Trotsky, the Zinoviev opposition poured new forces into the Trotskyite group and all together sunk so low as to undertake anti-Soviet activities on the eve of the Fifteenth Congress of the Party.

This merger was guided by one intention, namely, to gather all forces, all opponents of the Party line, for an attack against the Central Committee of the Party.

Such a policy created a new "philosophy"—the advocacy of the utilisation of every possible means to achieve its aim, the overthrow of the Party leadership. The whole subsequent activity of the opposition shows that it acted on the basis of this premise.

Realising that they were badly beaten, and wanting to prepare new forces for the continuation of this struggle, Zinoviev, at the Fourteenth Congress of the Party, made an appeal for a union of all anti-Party groupings. He proposed that "all the forces of all former groups in our Party be attracted to

* The reader should consult *Errors of Trotskyism and Where Is Trotsky Going?* Workers' Bookshop.

work and that they be given the possibility of working." Soon the Trotsky-Zinoviev group rallied around itself all the oppositional dregs and included them in the ranks of "the united opposition." They attracted the Shlyapnikov-Medvedev group which the Tenth Congress of the Party at Lenin's suggestion condemned as an anarcho-syndicalist group and which began to raise its head actively when it saw the attacks of the new opposition against the Central Committee. The opposition then attracted the "democratic centralist" group of Sapronov-Smirnov, which had clearly turned to counter-revolution. The Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition fully supported the scoundrel Ossovky, who spoke in favour of the development of bourgeois parliamentarism in the Soviet Union and who declared it necessary to allow the existence of various parties in the U.S.S.R., among them parties which could defend the interests of the capitalists—the Nepmen. Not limiting itself to gathering the enemies of the Party together in the Soviet Union, the opposition set out to rally opportunists of all shades in the ranks of the Communist International around itself. The opposition established contact with opportunists and enemies of Communism, expelled from the ranks of Communist Parties such as Maslov, Korsh, Urbans and Weber in Germany, Souvarine in France, etc., utilising the fact that Zinoviev occupied an important post in the Executive Committee of the C.I.

All Oppositions Rallied to Unprincipled Bloc.

This was how all opportunist forces hostile to the Party were attracted and rallied into one bloc. The same obtained with regard to the means of struggle. The opposition did not refrain from overstepping the limits of Party principles from the very outset. Being beaten, as they were, at the Fourteenth Congress and having suffered a defeat in the Leningrad organisation, which drove out the adherents of Zinoviev as soon as their true viewpoints became known, the opposition organised secret meetings of its adherents and went underground to wage a hidden struggle and prepare for new battles against the Party. In the summer of 1926 the Zinovievites organised a secret meeting in a forest near Moscow. At that meeting pseudonyms and pass-words were established, a report in opposition to the line of the Central Committee was given, and means of struggle against the Central Committee discussed. From the ranks of its adherents the opposition organised secret circles and groups which were supplied with literature, political platforms, leaflets and other "materials" by its leaders; Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Zalutsky, Bakayev and others. They established their own ignominious fractional morality as to how to behave before the Party Control Commission in case of failure. They thus created their own system, ideologically corrupt, secret and

demoralising, and not too fastidious in its selection of methods of struggle against the Party and its leadership.

The Central Committee of the Party, having discovered a series of facts in regard to the anti-Party fractional activity of the opposition ("the forest meeting," etc.) condemned them sharply, expelled Lashevich—the organiser of that meeting—from the ranks of the Central Committee, and warned them that the Party would take more drastic measures with regard to the anti-Party elements not discontinuing their struggle against the Party.

The Central Committee showed and extensively explained to the Party the whole anti-Leninist, Menshevik-Trotskyite and defeatist substance of the platform of the opposition, and the harmful essence of its fractional activity (decision of the July Plenum of the C.C. of C.P.S.U. in 1926).

Towards the end of 1926, the opposition, having suffered another series of defeats and being badly beaten at the meetings of the factory cells in Moscow and in Leningrad, into which it attempted to penetrate, made a declaration to the Central Committee on October 4th and 6th. The opposition recognised its accusations against the Central Committee as wrong, condemned the opportunists who were excluded from the Communist International, declared that fractional methods of struggle were impermissible and called upon its adherents to dissolve the existing fractional organisations. However, these declarations were nothing more than deception of the Party. The subsequent activity of the opposition proved that this was only a dishonest manoeuvre on its part. The opposition did not discontinue its fractional and sectarian activity. At the Fifteenth Party Conference of the C.P.S.U. and at the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the leaders of the opposition came out again in the defence of their old platform and their assertion of the impossibility of constructing socialism in the Soviet Union, thereby giving the signal to their adherents to again take up the struggle against the Party. At the same time the opposition continued its fractional and disruptive work in violation of the promises made to the Party. At the beginning of 1927, at a large non-Party meeting devoted to the anniversary of the "Pravda" Zinoviev made a criticism of the policy of the Party. Soon after this the opposition concocted the so-called "declaration of 83," and collected signatures under this platform all over the country. The signatories of the declaration proved to be a small, insignificant group. Everything that was best in the opposition left it and fought for the line of the Party. In its platform the opposition opposed its opportunist line to the general line of the Party on all questions and degenerated, in substance, to the platform of counter-

revolution. Towards the end of 1927, the opposition finally became organised into a separate underground Party, with its centre, respective local committees, membership dues, fractional discipline, etc. Not stopping at their struggle against the Party, the opposition turned to open anti-Soviet activity. They spoke at non-Party meetings, organised underground printing presses, utilising the assistance of open enemies of the Soviet Union in their work. The opposition formed a union with bourgeois intellectuals directly connected with white-guardists who had prepared a plot to overthrow the Soviet government. The opposition was opposed to the manifesto on the 7-hour working day. Finally, during the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution it came out on the streets with its slogans and attempted to organise an open anti-Soviet demonstration. All these facts showed that the opposition had taken to the path of open struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Fifteenth Congress of the Party, which met in December, 1927, expelled 75 active leaders of the opposition from the Party. Following Trotsky and Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Zalutsky, Rakovsky and Bakayev were also expelled. At the same time Kotolynov, Rummyantsev and others were also expelled. The Congress gave the following summary characteristic of the anti-Party and anti-Soviet Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition:

"The Fifteenth Congress places on record that, despite the warning of the Thirteenth Party Congress, which noted the 'petty-bourgeois deviation' of the Trotsky group, and despite the warning of the Fifteenth All-Union Party Conference concerning the 'social-democratic deviation' of the united opposition under Trotsky's leadership, the latter continued to intensify its revisionist errors from month to month, fighting against the C.P.S.U., appealing to non-proletarian elements in the country against the régime of the proletarian dictatorship. The ideology of the Opposition, which openly made an alliance with the renegades of international Communism (Maslov, Souvarine and Co.) has at the present time developed into and taken the shape of Menshevism in its peculiar Trotskyist form. The denial of the Socialist character of the Soviet State enterprises, the denial of the possibility of victorious Socialist construction in our country, the denial of the policy of an alliance of the working class with the basic masses of the peasantry, the denial of the organisational principles of Bolshevism (the policy of splitting the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern), logically led the Trotskyist Menshevik opposition to slander the U.S.S.R. as having a degenerating Thermidorian Government, and to the denial of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., and the counter-revolutionary struggle against it. (Resolution of the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., p. 174, C.P. Great Britain edition).*

Kamenev and Zinoviev, on more than one occasion, after making declarations of their errors and vows of allegiance to the Party again step forward to struggle against the Party. They were invariably present whenever it was a question of secret preparations

for a struggle against the Party and whenever an anti-Party bloc was being formed. In September, 1928, Kamenev carried on negotiations with the Trotskyites Pereverzyev and Kaplinsky, which were directed against the line of the Central Committee. During the period when the right opposition renewed its attacks, Kamenev had conversations with Bukharin in an attempt to arrange a bloc. Finally, when the counter-revolutionary offspring of the Rights—Ryutin, Slepkov and others organised their grouplet, they also gravitated to Zinoviev and Kamenev and discussed their counter-revolutionary platform of the restoration of capitalism with them.

The errors of Zinoviev and Kamenev, intensified manifold in the period of 1925-1927, brought them to a most ignominious anti-Party and anti-Soviet struggle.

The Zinovievites, after being smashed to bits by the Party and they were reduced to being "generals without an army," made declaration after declaration to the Central Committee of the Party of their repentance and recognition of the correctness of the line and entire policy of the Party, which they swore to defend.

The entire subsequent activity of the Zinovievites, however, showed that these vows of loyalty were directed towards getting their adherents back into the Party where they were to "sit tight" in anticipation of a more favourable moment. At the end of 1927, having been beaten by the Moscow proletariat, at the October demonstration, Kamenev and his followers declared that "AT THIS STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT their cause was lost." In this manner the leaders of the opposition gave directives to their adherents to simulate agreement with the line of the Party and prepare for struggle IN THE FUTURE. The Zinovievites penetrated into the Party by means of lies; they "crawled on their bellies" into the Party, assuring it of their solidarity, but actually they carried a stone in their bosom, ready to hurl at the Party at the very first favourable opportunity.

Such was the past of the Zinoviev opposition.

Such is a brief history of the organisation which nurtured the infamous assassins of Comrade Kirov. The development of this organisation shows what liquidationist ideas were used by the opposition to educate its scum and what rotten methods of struggle against the Party they assimilated.

The history of the struggle of the Zinoviev opposition against the Party shows the road of that opposition to the thrice accursed "Leningrad Centre."

The Origin of the Leningrad Terrorist Group.

Kotolynov, Tolmazov and Rummyantsev (who were in the same group as Nikoloyev and organised the murder of Comrade Kirov) were trained for struggle against the Party in the ranks of the Zinoviev opposi-

* Obtainable from Workers' Bookshop.—Ed.

tion and on its platform. At the secret Zinoviev meetings during 1925 and 1926, they went through the school of conspiracy and deceit which corrupted them to the core. It was precisely these men, under the direct leadership of Zinoviev and his henchmen, who organised the opposition in the Leningrad organisation of the Young Communist League and carried through resolutions refusing to recognise the decisions of the 14th Congress of the Party as correct.

It was these sprouts, planted at that time by the hand of Zinovievites and nurtured in the school of fractional oppositionist struggle, that grew later into the white-guardist-fascist murderers, the "Leningrad Centre."

The roots of the opposition remained in Leningrad more than in any other place. There, more than anywhere else, were the Zinovievites able to deceive the Party members from the beginning and it was there that the struggle against the opposition was particularly sharp. After the 14th Congress, the Central Committee sent a group of leading Party workers to Leningrad to explain the decisions of the Congress and to expose the opposition. The Central Committee sent Comrade Kirov there. At meetings of Party cells in the factories and shops in Leningrad, the members of the Central Committee explained to the Party masses the anti-Leninist substance of the Zinoviev opposition, and exposed the fraud with which the opposition carried on its preparations for the 22nd Leningrad Party Conference.

Under the leadership of Comrade Kirov, the backbone of the opposition in Leningrad was quickly broken. During the following years the Leningrad organisation, freed by Comrade Kirov from the influence of the opposition, and watched over by him, became a firm support of the Stalinist Central Committee.

Having failed with their "theories" about the impossibility of building socialism in one country, beaten to dust by the Party, and cast out of leading posts as a result of their struggle, they utilised their membership in the Party along lines taught them by the whole history of the oppositional struggle in order to be able to better deliver a blow at the Party. They were already poisoned by Zinoviev-Trotsky ideology and practice and infected with hatred of the Party and its leadership. It was from this viewpoint that they approached all the great achievements of

socialist construction, which gladden the hearts of millions of workers.

They did not therefore stop before the vilest of crimes. They killed one of the best men in the Party, a man beloved by the whole Party. They sent a bullet into the head of one of the best leaders of the working class.

In 1925-26 the Zinoviev opposition reflected the pressure of the petty-bourgeois forces upon the Party and the resistance of the class enemy to the transition of the proletariat to the broad socialist offensive; now this despicable scum of the opposition merely expresses the bestial hatred of the defeated remnants of the capitalist classes in the Soviet Union, crushed by the mighty advance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whom the broad socialist offensive has doomed to oblivion. At the same time these scoundrels express the tendencies of the whole of international counter-revolution, and the fond hopes and aspirations of fascism, the mortal enemy of the first proletarian state in the world.

The indictment of Nikolayev and others shows that

"the aims and methods of struggle of this counter-revolutionary terrorist group in Leningrad fully coincide with the aims and methods of the open enemies of the people—such as the emigré white-guardist, landlord-capitalist organisations, the 'Russian All Army Union' and the 'Brotherhood of Russian Truth' (adherents of Denikin), who openly preach terror, who brought about the murder of Comrade V. V. Vorovsky, P. L. Voykov and others, and systematically send their agents to the Soviet Union in order to organise and perpetrate terrorist acts against representatives of the Soviet Power."

The participants of the former Zinoviev anti-Soviet group established contact with the world counter-revolution and with the seasoned counter-revolutionary Trotsky, thus joining hands with all the enemies of the proletariat. Zinoviev's counter-revolutionary offsprings of the "Leningrad Centre" were dreaming of intervention and of an armed attack of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R. They fed on the money handed out by the agents of imperialist governments.

Thus the participants of the Zinoviev group, brought up by the Zinoviev opposition, are in the same ranks as the worst enemies of our socialist fatherland—as the landlords and capitalists whom the dictatorship of the proletariat overthrew and smashed during the October Revolution.

For these enemies there must be no quarter! More watchfulness, more vigilance in the day-to-day work of the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat!

2 9 0 3 0

Twenty Nine Thousand and Thirty Pounds

This is the magnificent total subscribed by workers to the various funds for the support of the DAILY WORKER during the five years of its existence.

WHY ?

Because it is the only Working-Class Newspaper in Great Britain.

Do you read it every day ?

Do you pass it on ?

Do you get new readers and thereby extend the battle front ?

If not, why don't you ?

It is your paper, fighting for you every day in every way.

Buy it. Read it. Pass it on.