

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1936

Unity will conquer

Workers Library Publishers, Inc

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Workers Library Publishers, Inc, "Unity will conquer" (1936). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 395.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/395>



**UNITY
WILL
CONQUER**

Published by

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.
P. O. BOX 148, STA. D, NEW YORK CITY

April, 1936



357

Contents

FOREWORD	5
I. THE OFFER	9
DIMITROFF'S APPEAL	9
DIMITROFF'S SECOND APPEAL	11
DOWN WITH WAR!	12
II. THE RESPONSE	16
ENGLAND	16
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	19
SCANDINAVIA	20
GERMANY	23
FRANCE	25
III. THE ANSWER	27
IV. UNITY WILL CONQUER DESPITE ALL	29
FOR UNITED ACTION OF THE WORLD PROLETARIAT	29
THE ITALIAN WAR, UNITED WORKING CLASS ACTION, AND THE POSITION OF THE LABOR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL, BY K. GOTTWALD	33

Foreword

SEVENTEEN years have passed since the end of the last World War. Millions of mutilated ex-servicemen are still suffering the hard and bitter fate of cripples. The widows have not yet forgotten their husbands, nor the children their fathers, who went down as victims in the war for higher profits, the war for economic domination, for colonies and spheres of influence. And once again, throughout the whole of the year 1935, the working people of all capitalist countries have been haunted by the nightmare of a new world war in the offing. Month after month Italian ships have been sailing for Africa with their load of troops, arms and munitions, accomplishing the planned project of fascist Italy's Ethiopian campaign. England's counter-measures, carried out beneath the hypocritical mask of defending peace, have been aimed in reality at defending England's own interests as an imperialist power.

Fascist Germany, Europe's most vicious instigator of war, encouraged by the bellicose threats of Italy, has brazenly flaunted its monstrous armaments. We have witnessed the beginning of a frenzied campaign against the Soviet Union, the only state which is resolutely fighting for peace. The Nuremberg Congress of the German National-Socialist Party became a general summons to the instigators of war. The elections in the Memel region provided the pretext for open threats of war against Lithuania. In the Far East the Japanese imperialists have intensified their activity, directing their especial efforts to converting North China into a Japanese vassal state. The dilatory course of the League of Nations discussions in Geneva, where the Soviet representatives alone expressed themselves unreservedly in favor of measures for the collective safeguarding of peace, has proved that the proletariat

cannot expect any effective steps from that quarter towards preventing war.

The working people of all countries have therefore been asking themselves: *Is there any chance of preventing the threatening catastrophe of war?*

It was under these circumstances that George Dimitroff declared from the rostrum of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International:

"The popular hatred of war is constantly gaining in depth and intensity. In pushing the toilers into the abyss of imperialist wars the bourgeoisie is staking its head. Today not only the working class, the peasantry and other toilers champion the cause of the preservation of peace, but also the oppressed nations and weak peoples whose independence is threatened by new wars. Even some of the big capitalist states, afraid of losing out in a new redivision of the world, are interested *at the present stage* in the avoidance of war.

"This gives rise to the possibility of forming a most extensive front of the working class, of all the toilers, and entire nations against the threat of imperialist war. Relying on the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the will of millions upon millions of toilers to have peace, our Congress has opened up the perspective of unfolding a wide anti-war front not only for the Communist vanguard but for the working class of the whole world, for the peoples of every land. The extent to which this world-wide front is realized and put into action will determine whether the fascist and other imperialist war incendiaries will be able in the near future to kindle a new imperialist war, or whether their fiendish hands will be hacked off by the axe of a powerful anti-war front."

These gripping words opened up a bold prospect of struggle for peace; they met with profound response in the ranks of the international working class and among all friends of peace. The situation urgently demanded effectual measures against the fascist war-plotters. To establish unity of action between the Labor and Socialist International and the Communist International for struggle against war became a vital necessity for the proletariat of all countries. The more so because war in Ethiopia threatened to break out at any moment.

On September 25 George Dimitroff sent the Labor and Socialist International a telegram on behalf of the Executive Committee

of the Communist International, proposing immediate common discussion regarding "the best means of carrying out by our common efforts those measures for the preservation of peace indicated by both your International and ours". The secretary of the Labor and Socialist International informed the Executive Committee of the Communist International that the Executive Committee of the L.S.I. would consider the Comintern's proposal. Eight days later the first victims among the Ethiopian people—men, women and children—were done to death by the gas bombs of Italian airplanes. On October 7 Dimitroff again applied to Adler with an urgent appeal for immediate negotiations with the object of exerting all efforts to the end "that Italian military action against Ethiopia should be stopped, that the war should not spread to other parts of the world and should not become the prelude to a new world slaughter". The answer to this appeal came on October 13 with the publication of a resolution adopted at the Brussels session of the Executive Committee of the L.S.I. Referring to the attitude taken by the representatives of five Social-Democratic Parties, the resolution declined the Comintern's proposal to start negotiations and permitted nothing but discussion of a purely "informational" character.

Millions of proletarians saw themselves duped in their hopes. They saw the split of the working class and the consequent weakness of the proletariat in the struggle against war and fascism. Here, however, a chance was offered of overcoming the split in the struggle against war. They saw at the same time that the defeat of the fascist robbers could mean a decisive blow against fascism in general, and this increased their desire for unity still further.

Who bears responsibility for the fact that this unity of the world proletariat in the struggle against war and fascism did not come to pass? The proletariat, menaced as it is by the bloody sacrifices of war, has a right to receive an answer to this question. An unprejudiced study of the documents which we have collected in this pamphlet leads to the following conclusion: *International unity of action in the struggle against war has temporarily failed to come about because of the resistance offered by those reactionary*

leaders of the L.S.I. who, regardless of the fact that war has already begun, continue to ally themselves with "their" bourgeoisie. But even those leaders who, while taking a different stand at the session of the L.S.I., nevertheless ended up by bowing to the dictates of the reactionary minority, cannot be acquitted of responsibility for the temporary failure of international unity of action.

However, the question of international unity of action is not ended with the negative answer of the L.S.I. *The struggle for the unity of action of the world proletariat is being continued.* But in order to carry on this struggle successfully, we must have clear vision, must know the way that leads to unity, and see the obstacles that have to be overcome. International unity of action must be fought for and won. This requires that all class-conscious workers, all adherents of peace, achieve unity of action in the struggle against war and fascism in their own country, their own locality, their own factory. The greatness of the danger that hovers over the working class and all toiling people, the bloody sacrifices that the Italian and Ethiopian peoples are already being forced to make today—these things justify and imperatively demand the most supreme efforts towards establishing the world front against war and overcoming all those who would sabotage the united front. The documents of the Communist International here published by us show how these problems must be solved.

THE PUBLISHERS

The Offer

Dimitroff's Appeal

TO THE LABOR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Moscow, September, 25, 1935.

COMRADES, war may break out in Ethiopia at any moment. The German fascists are only waiting for this moment in order to hurl themselves on weak Lithuania and occupy Memel. The war measures of Italian fascism and of German fascism will have incalculable consequences. They may lead to a world war.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International instructed the Executive Committee of the Communist International to approach the leadership of the Labor and Socialist International with the proposal to establish international unity of action of the proletariat.

We know that your Executive Committee decided fundamentally to examine the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International before adopting a position on the question of unity of action. And in order to give you this possibility we wished to wait somewhat before making to you our concrete proposals for negotiations on this subject. But the international situation is so strained, the danger of the outbreak of a new imperialist war is so menacing and so close that there is not an hour to lose.

The last conference of the Labor and Socialist International and of the International Federation of Trade Unions decided on a certain number of measures against the threatening war.

The Communist International welcomes your decision. But all that has been done until now on your part and on ours is still insufficient in face of the magnitude of the danger. It is necessary

to unite the efforts of the two Internationals in order to maintain peace. They must act in concert and by their common efforts stay the hand of the fascist instigators of war.

The common action of the two Internationals would mobilize the working class and would secure the support of the forces of peace among other classes of the population. It would draw whole peoples into the fight for peace. It would call forth an international movement against war of such power that the League of Nations, under its pressure, would be compelled to undertake really effective action against the aggression of Italian fascism and German fascism. It is not yet too late to prevent the terrible catastrophe into which the fascist criminals want to hurl mankind. Tomorrow this may no longer be possible.

For this reason we propose to the Secretariat of the Labor and Socialist International immediate personal negotiations between representatives of the two Internationals to discuss the best means of carrying out by our common efforts those measures for the preservation of peace indicated by both your International and ours.

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Communist International we delegate for these negotiations Comrades Cachin and Thorez, of France, Comrade Pollitt, of Great Britain, and Comrade Schwerma, of Czechoslovakia.

We request that you reply immediately.

Greetings.

*For the Executive Committee
of the Communist International,*

GEORGE DIMITROFF, *General Secretary*

Dimitroff's Second Appeal

TO THE LABOR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Moscow, October 7, 1935.

WAR has already been raging in Africa for several days. The international working class has been unable to prevent this war,

just as it was unable to prevent German fascism coming to power, because its organizations did not act unitedly and in solidarity.

As a result, the working class was not in a position to launch a mighty people's movement of all peace-loving classes and peoples against the incendiaries of war, thus erecting an insurmountable wall against war.

On September 25, 1935, that is, eight days before the opening of military hostilities, we telegraphed the secretariat of the Labor and Socialist International proposing immediate personal negotiations between representatives of both Internationals regarding the best possible means of carrying out, by our joint efforts, the measures planned by both your International and ours for the maintenance of peace. The Secretariat of the Labor and Socialist International thereupon informed us that the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International would deal with our proposal. But so far we have not received a favorable reply from the Executive Committee of the L.S.I.

The fact that joint action by both Internationals was not immediately achieved undoubtedly encouraged the fascist war incendiaries to proceed with open military action.

Now that so much time has already been lost, it is all the more our duty and yours at this moment to put a stop to military action and prevent the war from spreading to other parts of the world.

Any further delay in bringing about united action in the struggle against the war that has already begun would be fatal. Anyone who still hesitates or delays, in this grave hour, to unite all the forces of the working class and all the toilers, and to employ all means so that Italian military action against Ethiopia should be stopped, that the war should not spread to other parts of the world and should not become the prelude to a new world slaughter, assumes a historic responsibility before the world proletariat.

In the interest of peace and in the name of the millions of workers in our ranks and yours who demand joint action in the struggle against war and fascism, we once more stress the urgency of a favorable reply from the Executive of the Labor and Socialist International to our proposal.

We once again inform you that the delegation we have appointed

is waiting in Paris for negotiations to begin, and we ask you to communicate the time and place of negotiations to the address of Comrade Cachin, editorial office of *Humanité*.

*For the Executive Committee
of the Communist International,*

GEORGE DIMITROFF, *General Secretary*

Down With War!

Moscow, October 7, 1935.

To all workers and their organizations! To all opponents of war and friends of peace! To all peoples who do not want a repetition of the world slaughter of 1914-18!

The imperialist struggle of the big capitalist states, primarily Great Britain and Italy, in regard to Ethiopia, has led to an onslaught by Italian fascism on the Ethiopian people. Italian aeroplanes are bombarding the peaceful towns and villages of Ethiopia.

Under cover of suspicious concern about the "independence" of Ethiopia, British imperialism is preparing for war with Italy for the possession of Ethiopia. The British navy is prepared for action. Along with Britain, other imperialist states are demanding a protectorate over Ethiopia, allegedly in the interests of restoring peace.

The war instigators in other countries are displaying feverish activity. Fascist Germany is striving to utilize the war in Africa for the purpose of preparing an attack on Lithuania. Germany, Poland and Hungary are fixing up an aggressive bloc in Eastern Europe. The Austrian problem is again being put on the order of the day. Military complications in Europe would untie the hands of the Japanese imperialists in the Far East for the armed seizure of other parts of China, and would increase their aggressiveness against the Soviet Union to an extraordinary degree. The war of Italian fascism against Ethiopia may become the prelude to a new world imperialist war.

On September 25, eight days before military operations were begun, the Communist International addressed a proposal to the Labor and Socialist International for joint action against war.

The Labor and Socialist International has not given a positive reply to our proposal up to the present, because there are great contradictions in its ranks. Those elements in the Labor and Socialist International who are allied with the bourgeoisie of their respective countries are concerned not so much about preserving peace as about the imperialist interests of their own ruling classes. That is why they are exerting all their efforts to prevent the establishment of united working-class action in each separate country and on an international scale.

At this exceedingly serious moment, when the lives of millions are at stake, the working class must imperatively demand that the road be cleared for the mighty stream of proletarian unity, despite all resistance of the opponents of the united front. We are convinced that the supporters of the united front in the ranks of the Labor and Socialist International will do everything possible to ensure that the proposal made by the Communist International is accepted.

Not another minute must be lost! Not for another instant must there be any postponement of the establishment of unity of action by all workers' organizations and all the friends of peace in all countries, so as to isolate and curb the fascist instigators of war!

The Communist International calls upon all its Sections to proceed immediately to organize powerful action by all the toilers against the war. The Communist International insistently appeals to the Socialist workers, their organizations and parties, to come out jointly, shoulder to shoulder, in spite of differences of opinion which have existed up to now, against the fascist instigators of war.

The Communist International calls on all workers, on all their organizations, no matter what their trend, on all those who are opposed to war, on all the friends of peace, on all peoples who do not desire a repetition of the horrors of the World War, to muster their forces so as to frustrate the robber war begun by Italian fascism, to deal the latter a severe blow and thus support the Italian

people in their fight for liberation. It calls upon the working class in each separate country to display the greatest watchfulness in regard to the policy of its imperialist government. It calls upon the toilers to prevent the war spreading to other countries, and to prevent the Italo-Ethiopian war being transformed into a new world blood bath.

Workers and toilers of all countries!

Organize immediate joint action against the war in all enterprises, in all organizations, in all trade unions, in all cooperative societies, in all sports and cultural and educational organizations, in all municipal councils and parliaments—everywhere. Get together in mighty meetings and demonstrations! Apply other effective forms of mass action as well, according to the situation. Show Italian fascism that you will not tolerate its provocative acts of war! Show the ruling classes your power in the fight for peace!

By the united action of all workers' organizations, and primarily of the transport workers', railwaymen's, seamen's and harbor workers' organizations insist that not a single train, not a single ship, move in support of the Italian war in Ethiopia.

The carrying out of this militant measure means encircling Italy with an iron ring of isolation and smashing the war begun by it; it means a heavy blow against all the fascist instigators of war who are preparing to follow the example of Italian fascism.

The governments of the biggest capitalist states represented in the League of Nations are again dooming it to impotence. The game of self-seeking interests of the imperialist states is rendering impossible effective collective action by the League of Nations against the fascist inciters of war.

Salvation from war lies in the hands of the international proletariat and their organizations, it depends upon their joint powerful action. The peace policy of the Soviet Union, the only state carrying on a resolute struggle against imperialist acts of plunder, and consistently carrying out a policy of peace, is the strongest bulwark of the international proletariat in their struggle against imperialist wars and for the cause of peace.

In this hour of a threatening danger, the Communist International hurls forth the call:

Workers of all countries, unite! Not a single train, not a single ship in support of the Italian war in Ethiopia! Let us surround the fascist instigators of war with an iron ring of isolation! Hands off the Ethiopian people! Down with imperialist war! Long live the Soviet policy of peace! Long live peace!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The Response

[The material which this pamphlet contains would be incomplete if we did not give at least a brief survey of how the appeal of Dimitroff and of the Communist International for common struggle against war were received in the different circles of the Labor and Socialist International. In this case, as always, it is best to let the facts speak for themselves. Since it is impossible, on the other hand, to collect all the available material in a topical pamphlet, we will confine ourselves to quoting one or two characteristic utterances of the Social-Democratic press, of Social-Democratic leaders and, above all, of the masses of Social-Democratic workers and their organizations in the most important countries. The picture which will thereby be given, in conjunction with the stand taken by the Executive Committee of the L.S.I. in Brussels, shows quite clearly the tremendous differences between the desires of the Social-Democratic workers and those who have prevented the setting up of the united front.—THE PUBLISHERS]

England

WORKERS' RESOLUTIONS FOR UNITY OF ACTION

THE trade union councils of Oxford and London declared themselves in favor of united action on the part of the Comintern and Second International with the object of putting a stop to the Italo-Ethiopian war.

The North London district of the United Metal Workers Union and a conference of trade union and cooperative delegates in Clydeside declared themselves in favor of unity of action.

The Ferndale and Tylorstown local groups of the Miners' Union of South Wales sent a resolution to the leaders of the Labor Party, challenging the L.S.I. to begin negotiations as proposed by the Communist International.

The Walthamstow local group of the Employees Union appealed to the Labor Party to support the proposal of the Comintern. The Furniture Workers Union, the Municipal Employees Union of Scotland, the Leicester local group of the Union of Railwaymen, the London groups of the Woodworkers Trade Union and the Union of Transport Workers, the transport workers of Camberwell, the cooperative guild of Buckhaven (Scotland), and others, adopted resolutions for unity of action among the workers.

TRADE UNION LEADERS AND PROMINENT MEMBERS OF THE LABOR PARTY APPEAL TO THE L.S.I.

"Italian airmen are dropping an average of 400 bombs a day on the people of Ethiopia. Soldiers are dying in agony from poison gas, skins are seared, eyes blinded, lungs wrecked.

"No wonder the Ethiopian general declared to the press yesterday: 'They called us savages, but we would never resort to the use of gas, which apparently is Italy's first contribution to the new civilization for Ethiopia.'

"It is this situation that prompts us to express the hope that this week-end, when the Second International meets at Brussels, it will be found possible to accept the appeal of George Dimitroff for a joint meeting of the Second International and the Communist International, to work out a common plan of action to stop the war and slaughter now going on in Ethiopia.

"We believe that such a decision would be welcomed by everyone who hates war and fascism.

"It would correspond to the magnificent example given by the Dockers Trade Union of France, and the Cardiff dockers and seamen who have already demonstrated their determination to oppose the war of Italian fascism in Ethiopia."

The appeal is signed by John Bromley, Professor Catlin, Dudley Collard, David Freeman, Alex Gossip, G. H. Loman, Leah Manning, D. N. Pritt, John Parker, Ben Tillett, W. H. Thomp-

son, Dorothy Woodman, Monica Whatley, Lieut.-Comdr. E. B. Young, J. B. S. Haldane.

(Quoted from the British *Daily Worker*, October 12, 1935.)

FROM LETTERS OF TRADE UNION MEMBERS AND LABOR PARTY
FUNCTIONARIES TO THE DAILY WORKER (OCT. 15, 1935.)

Ted Williams (*Labor M.P. for Ogmore Division*): "Whatever may have been the reasons in the past for a split in the ranks of the working class, the present fascist attack upon the independence of Ethiopia in violation of the Covenant of Peace is so momentous that both Internationals should take joint action for the stopping of war and maintenance of world peace."

John Hill (*General Secretary of Boilermakers Society*): "I have your letter referring to the war in Africa and the existing divisions in the ranks of the workers, thus weakening our efforts for world peace.

"This is not the time nor place to raise the issues which divide us. The workers of the world are passionately desirous of peace and justice, and this can only be obtained by working class unity."

Steve Lawther (*Blaydon Labor Councillor*): "I am acquainted with and fully agree with Dimitroff's letter on Ethiopia and the world situation and am doing all I can in this area to win support for an early meeting of the two Internationals."

Frank Rowlands (*Society of Operative House and Ship Painters and Decorators*): "The approach is timely, never was there more need to cement the whole of the working class movements under one united international.

"The rank and file must move that their leaders give more consideration to this urgent problem than before.

"Let the whole working class movement in Britain follow the lead set by French, Swiss and Latvian Socialists and join hands to defeat the menace of Europe and sound the death-knell of fascism."

Czechoslovakia

THIS IS HOW THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITED FRONT SPEAK

Pravo Lidu (organ of the Socialist Party of Czechoslovakia) of October 17, 1935, writes as follows:

"Our Communists blame the Czechoslovakian delegates personally for having forced on the Brussels resolution. This is not true, but if it were, it would be perfectly in order because the question of the united front really concerns only Czechoslovakia. . . . Schmeral appeals for the workers' united front in order to launch a great struggle of the working class masses for the release of all Communists who have been sentenced for espionage, high treason, acts of violence and campaigns against the President. This, then, is why the Communists need the united front! Their deputies, editors, and secretaries are to carry on seditious and mischievous practices, and the Social-Democratic Party is to guarantee impunity for these acts by its influence in the government. . . ."

Pravo Lidu of October 3, 1935, tells of a session of the Executive Committee of the Czech Social-Democrats at which, "after a thorough debate about the appeal of the Comintern to the L.S.I., it was decided to maintain *the same stand as previously* and to convey this also to the party's representative in the International".

The Prague *Sozialdemokrat* of September 24, 1935, publishes a resolution of the Reichenberg district of the German Socialist Party in Czechoslovakia, from which we quote the following:

"From the standpoint of historic responsibility, it is necessary to place on record at precisely this moment that, after Dimitroff's explanations and those of several speakers in the debate, the aim of the Communist united front is decidedly not the real unity of the labor movement but the destruction of the Social-Democratic Parties in Central and Western Europe. The united front which the Communists demand has as its ultimate political object the setting up of Soviet dictatorship in Europe, regardless of whether the political and economic pre-requisites for this are present in Central and Western Europe. . . ."

"Considering the practical results of the Third International's

Seventh World Congress, which has not meant fundamentally any step towards real unity in the labor movement, the district conference, in the interests of the workers of our state, rejects the Communist proposals for unity, which are not sincerely meant.

"It appeals to all party members and trade union functionaries of the district not to let themselves be misused for a new united front maneuver on the part of the Communists, introduced with other words but with the same objects as before, but to make every effort to rally the anti-fascist forces within the working class of the district under the banners of democratic socialism."

AND THIS IS THE STAND OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS

The employees of twenty-two Prague works, including the well-known "Sana", Osram, Brosche and Zatzka factories, sent a telegram to Friedrich Adler through their factory committees, appealing to the L.S.I. to accept Dimitroff's proposal for unity of action against war.

A conference of functionaries of the Czech Social-Democratic Party in the Strakonitz district and unity demonstrations of the Czech Social-Democrats, the Czech Socialists and the Communist Party in Lundenburg, Göding and Pribram declared themselves in favor of a united struggle. The employees of a number of mines in Northwest Bohemia sent telegrams at the last moment to Brussels, demanding that Dimitroff's proposal be accepted.

A peace demonstration in Trautenau, which was attended by numerous workers and young people of the Socialist Party, Communists and non-party workers, sent a telegram to Friedrich Adler demanding immediate negotiations between the two Internationals with a view to united action against war and fascism.

Scandinavia

THE OPPONENTS OF UNITED ACTION

Ny Tid, the organ of the party leadership of the Socialist Party of Sweden, writes on October 16:

"The Comintern has sent two telegrams proposing the 'united front.' . . . In answer, the secretariat of the L.S.I. declared that

the question would be discussed at the November conference. Until then the gentlemen in Moscow would have to wait! Then came the outbreak of war. Dimitroff, the secretary of the Communist International, had a fresh fit of energy. . . . *Tovarisch Dimitroff had the good taste to assert on this occasion that the cause of the outbreak of war in Ethiopia was—that the representatives of the Second International had not come to meet the boys of the Comintern in order to talk about the ‘united front.’* This, of course, bears evidence of profound insight into world problems. The Comintern, on this occasion, made an extra slip in its choice of delegates for the proposed negotiations. The gentlemen in Moscow ought to have known that the British Labor Party could never debase itself to negotiating with such a figure as Harry Pollitt, who has never done anything but carry on a dirty campaign against the great British Labor Party and its leaders. The name of the Czech Schwerma could likewise not be expected to awaken the least trace of sympathy among our Czechoslovakian party friends, but quite the opposite. Dimitroff was good when he routed the Nazis in Leipzig. Now, when he has to manipulate the ‘united front’ with the Social-Democrats, he does not seem half so good as before.”

THE WORKERS DEMAND COMMON STRUGGLE

The leaders of the Swedish Seamen’s Union decided to call upon the International Trade Union Confederation to do all in their power at the Brussels congress to achieve united action on the part of labor organizations. The slogan of collaboration with a view to stopping transport of war materials to Italy and other imperialist states must be issued at once, according to the Seamen’s Union.

A meeting of trade union members of the Stockholm hotel employees passed a resolution demanding that the L.S.I. and the Comintern get together and discuss immediate measures for the struggle for peace.

The Stockholm Bus Drivers Union, section 217 of the Municipal Workers Union, adopted a resolution at their members’ meeting, calling upon the L.S.I. and other peace-loving organizations to take measures in direct conjunction with the Comintern for furthering the cause of peace. The local group also approved the proposal of

the Communist Party organizations in Stockholm to the local groups of the Social-Democratic Party and the Socialist Party for the calling of a common anti-war conference.

Trade Union 186 of the Municipal Workers Union in Stockholm and the trade union of unskilled workers in Härnösand declared themselves in favor of immediate joint discussions between the L.S.I. and the Comintern.

A meeting of the Seamen's Union in Härnösand (Sweden) adopted a resolution regretting the rejection of the united front proposal of the Comintern by the Second International and demanding that the united front against war be nevertheless established.

In Gruvön the trade union of the Paper Industry Workers Federation voted for an appeal at their last membership meeting calling upon the Transport Workers International and its unions to prevent the sending of arms to Italy and other fascist countries. The appeal further calls upon the L.S.I., the Comintern and other peace-loving organizations to begin immediate discussion on measures for the promotion of peace.

GEORG BRANTING'S LETTER TO NY DAG

"Stockholm, October, 2, 1935.

"The Comintern, through its president Dimitroff, has made a proposal to the secretariat of the Labor and Socialist International that in view of the menacing war danger an immediate personal discussion between representatives of the two Internationals be called with a view to the best possible carrying out of the measures planned by both for safeguarding peace. *Ny Dag* has asked me about my personal attitude to this matter.

"The political organizations of the working class must neglect no measure at this time which is capable of strengthening the peace front. Previously, at a less critical moment, the representatives of the two Internationals came together, and the exchange of opinions at that time did not concern such a sharply defined question as the present one.

"Were I a member of the Executive Committee of the L.S.I., I would recommend a conference of this kind in the hope of ef-

fectually furthering the cause of peace and of the working class.

"As regards my attitude to the facts, I would like to refer to my statement addressed to the Social-Democratic Party conference in which, among other things, I made the proposal that the party congress declare itself in favor of a Swedish foreign policy which should defend peace by a policy of collective security against aggressive fascist imperialism.

"G. BRANTING."

Germany

THE LEFT SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS FOR UNITY OF ACTION

The *R.-S.-Briefe*, published by the "Work Circle of Revolutionary Socialists", publishes an appeal under the title "The World Proletariat at the Crossroads". We give the following extract:

"It is not yet too late . . . !

"It is necessary to unite the efforts of the two Internationals in order to maintain peace. They must act in concert, and by their common efforts stay the hand of the fascist instigators of war. The common action of the two Internationals would mobilize the working class and would secure the support of the forces of peace among other classes of the population. It would draw whole peoples into the fight for peace. It would call forth an international movement against war of such a power that the League of Nations, under its pressure, would be compelled to undertake really effective action against the aggression of Italian fascism and German fascism. It is not yet too late to avert the terrible catastrophe into which the fascist criminals want to hurl mankind. Tomorrow this may no longer be possible!"
(From Dimitroff's telegram to Friedrich Adler.)

"With these words the General Secretary of the Comintern, Dimitroff, proposed immediate negotiations towards the forming of a world workers' front to the general secretary of the Labor and Socialist International, Adler. This proposal, which is the concrete expression of the new line just decided upon at the World Congress of the Comintern, can become a decisive turning-point in the history of the working class. After the experiences of the past one may not be too sanguine about the problem of unity, but in this case, considered purely according to the objective conditions, which im-

peratively demand a general change of front, we see *an opportunity which cannot be valued too highly* for the struggle against war and for the advance of the working class throughout Europe. . . .

“But all these very real considerations are outweighed by the tremendous fact that the world working class has now adopted an open militant stand along the whole line. The English Labor Party has broken away from its pacifist isolation and thrown its whole weight into the struggle against war. In France, where united action is taking a course which may serve as a model for future history, the divided trade unions have, to the joy of the proletariat, returned to organizational unity, while the political parties of the Marxist movement are in a constant process of fusion. But above all in Germany, where the unification of the proletariat has become a revolutionary necessity, numerous Social-Democratic and Communist groups have recently adopted unity of action, despite the fact that hitherto all initiative from above had been lacking.

“We welcome this activity on the part of the workers, which has begun to make itself felt powerfully in the land of the most brutal fascist regime, and which is well suited to bring pressure to bear upon authorities which have opposed the united front for reasons which are anything but revolutionary. Now of necessity the hour has come in Germany when negotiations between one organization and another must be started, as we have always demanded, if Social-Democracy is not to run the risk of bringing about fatal disorganization by the lack of central agreements now that action has already started in the various regions. . . .

“Dimitroff’s appeal to Friedrich Adler is likewise an appeal to the German proletariat to throw all its forces into the struggle against the threatening catastrophe of war, to establish the unity of the working class and to pave the way for the overthrow of the war criminals with the united front. This time, however, with other and more radical means than in 1918! If the acquiescence in the war and the unrevolutionary attitude taken during this carnage of the peoples have broken its unity and converted the revolution into a petty-bourgeois movement, the revolutionary struggle against war and unremitting hatred of the fascist regime must re-establish its unity and bring about the final victory of socialism.”

France

THE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE FRENCH UNITED FRONT DEMAND INTERNATIONAL UNITY OF ACTION

The French united and People's Front and its successful struggle against the fascist danger and against the policy of the Laval government, which is harmful and dangerous to peace, are the great example which has inspired will for unity in the proletariat of all countries. The French proletariat has proved by its example that unity in struggle is possible and needful for the whole working people. The establishment of trade union unity on the basis of the class struggle has given a new mighty impulse to the will for struggle and victory of the French working class. Thus it was only natural that the French proletariat should have responded to Dimitroff's appeal with enthusiastic approval. Countless meetings and conferences of the united front organizations appealed to the L.S.I. to accept the proposal of the Comintern. It would take us beyond the bounds of this pamphlet merely to record all these telegrams, decisions and resolutions. The struggle of the French proletariat in itself speaks clearly enough in favor of international unity of action.

JEAN ZYROMSKI: "UNITY WITH DIMITROFF"

We quote the following important passages from this article which appeared in *Le Populaire* of November 4, 1935:

"Comrade George Dimitroff has become Secretary of the Comintern. His personality lends him an indisputable authority. His report and his utterances at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern are of capital importance. Even those who do not quite share our point of view admit that important steps towards international unity of action have been made by this leader. . . .

"Such is the position. The main thing now is to get started. If we exclude from the Communist documents this tendency to want always to center *everything* around Soviet Russia, if we examine the essence of the matter, we shall realize that there is *nothing* irreconcilable, *nothing* incompatible between the positions of the different parties any longer.

"The junction points, the synthesis, are not only *possible* but *visible*. . . .

"Dimitroff also speaks of the necessity for the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and of setting up the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets.

"There is no decisive difficulty here. For can we not come to terms about the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat, which our party as a whole has always accepted? (See Léon Blum's declarations at Tours in 1920). . . .

"As regards the 'Soviet form' which the dictatorship of the proletariat must take, I do not think it is necessary to foresee the various stages of its formation and its functioning in a unity pact. . . .

"And could we forget—we who have always rightly placed our party under the threefold aegis of Jaurès, Guesde, and Vaillant—that the last of these conceived of the general arming of the people as a decisive revolutionary weapon? . . .

"Dimitroff also speaks of the *refusal to support our own bourgeoisie in an imperialist war*. Our party has vigorously expressed itself against any kind of a 'peace of god' (*union sacrée*), and in this respect there is no difference of opinion among us. Perhaps we may even find Dimitroff's formula too vague, for we cannot conceive of supporting the bourgeoisie under any circumstances so long as it is in power. . . .

"Finally we come to the great problem of the 'structure' of the united party. The term 'democratic centralism' is not important for us. We must have complete inner democracy, to guarantee freedom of decision for the lower organs and free expression of opinion within the united party; in return, however, we must demand complete homogeneity in public activity *in all its forms* together with complete coordination guaranteed by the regular functioning of the central authorities, whose decisions, adopted within the framework of the policy desired and approved by the whole party, are binding on the regional and local organizations.

"The necessary synthesis is thus possible. Why, then, discussion about procedure, why delay? All this is beside the point, of secondary importance. Let us get started!"

The Answer

RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE LABOR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

IN a joint discussion with the International Federation of Trade Unions the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International at its Brussels Congress passed resolutions on the two points of the agenda—"Broadening of Anti-War Action" and "Telegram of the Communist International". After a very thorough debate the following resolution was adopted unanimously, the Georgian delegate alone abstaining:

"At the joint conference held on October 12, 1935, the Executive Committee of the L.S.I., in complete agreement with the International Federation of Trade Unions, decided to adopt a number of measures for the successful conduct of the struggle against the attack of Italian fascism on Ethiopia and against the war danger in Europe.

"The Secretariat of the L.S.I. is commissioned to inform the Communist International of the results of the joint conference with the International Federation of Trade Unions.

"As regards the invitation from the Communist International to meet four representatives appointed by that body, the Socialist Parties in Great Britain, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Czechoslovakia have stated that they cannot accept this invitation, on the one hand because of the composition of the delegation from the Communist International, on the other hand, because they reject any unity with the Communist Parties in their own countries and any joint action between the two Internationals.

"The Executive Committee of the L.S.I. is obliged to take into account the views of these great parties of the working class,

and is therefore unable to accept the invitation of the Communist International.

"However, the Executive Committee of the L.S.I. is in every respect desirous of combining all effectual actions against war and against the fascist instigators of war. It is therefore obvious that its president and secretary are free in the exercise of their functions to hold informational discussions with persons and representatives of international labor organizations and also of other organizations which are conducting actions against war, in so far as they think fit.

"But as the resolution of the Executive Committee of the L.S.I. of November 17, 1934, in which it gave its affiliated parties the right to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to establish united action with the Communist Parties of their respective countries, is still in force, it is also clear that the above-mentioned parties have no intention of conducting joint actions with the Communist Parties of their countries."

Unity Will Conquer Despite All

For United Action of the World Proletariat

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL ON THE STAND TAKEN BY THE LABOR AND
SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL IN BRUSSELS.

Moscow, November 5, 1935.

ON September 25, 1935, the Executive Committee of the Communist International addressed a proposal to the Labor and Socialist International to establish united action against the attack of Italian fascism upon the Ethiopian people. On October 7, when war had become an accomplished fact, this proposal was repeated by Comrade Dimitroff, General Secretary of the Comintern, in the name of the Communist International.

The Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International, at its meeting in Brussels, on October 12, decided to reject the proposals of the Communist International.

In view of this decision of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International, the Executive Committee of the Communist International declares:

1. The decision of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International will cause profound disappointment among all workers who cherished the hope that after the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, which did its utmost to bring about the united action of the international proletariat, the proposal of the Communist International for a united front would be accepted. Although at the meeting of the

Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International the majority of the representatives of the Social-Democratic Parties were inclined to accept the proposal of the Communist International, that proposal was nevertheless rejected on the categorical demand of five parties. The responsibility for this falls primarily on the representatives of the British Labor Party (J. Compton, G. Dallas, H. Dalton and W. Gillies), the Dutch Social-Democratic Party (J. W. Albarda and K. Vorrinck), the Swedish Social-Democratic Party (Z. Höglund and R. Lindström), the Danish Social-Democratic Party (V. W. Christensen) and the Czechoslovakian Social-Democratic Party (F. Soukup, J. Stivin and A. Schäfer). These people at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International did what the reactionary bourgeoisie demands of Social-Democratic leaders who seek ministerial posts. In order to retain the confidence of the bourgeoisie they sacrificed the interests of the working class and the interests of the struggle for peace.

2. We submit to the court of the international proletariat the conduct of these people who, at a moment when war is raging in Ethiopia, when the military aggression of Japanese imperialism in China is growing, and the danger of a world war is increasing, are frustrating the establishment of united action by both Internationals and are thus bringing grist to the mill of the warmongers in the various countries. Under the pressure of the leaders of these five Social-Democratic Parties, the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International has for the third time rejected the proposal of the Communist International to establish united action, and is thus allowing a free hand to the most reactionary and bloodthirsty elements among the bourgeoisie. The rejection of the proposal made by the Communist International on March 5, 1933, for a joint struggle against fascism, encouraged the outbreak of unbridled fascist terror in Germany. The rejection of the proposal of the Communist International of October 10, 1934, at the time of the armed fighting in Asturias, facilitated the reprisals against the workers of Spain. So, now, the decision of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International may encourage military aggression on the part not only

of the Italian fascists, but also of the German fascists, the Japanese militarists, and other fomenters of war.

By yielding to the reactionary tendencies of the representatives of five parties, and by uttering no word in condemnation of their disruptive attitude, so profoundly inimical to the interests of the working class, the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International has placed the reactionary endeavor to preserve the alliance with the bourgeoisie higher than the vital interests of the international labor movement.

3. In view of the fact that the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International states in its resolution that at a joint conference with representatives of the International Federation of Trade Unions held on October 12, it was decided "to adopt a number of measures for the successful conduct of the struggle against the attack of Italian fascism on Ethiopia and against the war danger in Europe", the Executive Committee of the Communist International, on the basis of the information received from the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International, is regretfully obliged to note that these measures merely amount to assurances in words of support for the peace policy of the League of Nations, to a few demands and wishes addressed to the League of Nations (chiefly on the question of sanctions). This exclusive reliance on the measures of the League of Nations in actual fact reflects the endeavor of the leaders of the British Labor Party to direct the international labor movement into the wake of the foreign policy of the imperialist government of Great Britain.

It would be absurd, however, to believe that the League of Nations will do everything possible to ensure peace, and that, consequently, the masses of the people may calmly adopt an attitude of passive waiting. It must not be forgotten that the conflict of interests of the imperialist states within the League of Nations makes it extremely difficult to use the League as an instrument of peace. The facts show that the League of Nations has so far done nothing serious in defense of peace, while certain imperialist powers are trying within the framework of the League of Nations to arrive at an agreement for the partition of Ethiopia.

But even if the League of Nations is regarded as an instrument which might to a certain extent hinder the outbreak of war, this does not mean that the policy of the League of Nations can act as a substitute for the struggle of the proletariat. On the contrary, independent joint mass action by the workers and by all sincere friends of peace is essential to induce the League of Nations also to take effective measures of some kind against the war danger.

4. At the same time, the Executive Committee of the Communist International notes with satisfaction that the number of representatives of Social-Democratic Parties who expressed themselves in favor of accepting the proposal of the Communist International has grown as compared with the previous meeting of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International, which is a sign of undoubted success of the idea of proletarian unity. The Executive Committee of the Communist International expresses the hope that the Social-Democratic Parties whose representatives in the leadership of the Labor and Socialist International expressed themselves in favor of united proletarian action, will immediately proceed to establish or consolidate the united front in their own countries, the more so since the decision of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International allows the Social-Democratic Parties "the right to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to establish united action with the Communist Parties of their respective countries". The Executive Committee of the Communist International, for its part, charges the Communists to do their utmost to facilitate the achievement of this urgent aim.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International notes that the number of friends of the proletarian united front against fascism is rapidly growing also within the Socialist organizations and trade unions of Great Britain, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Czechoslovakia. This is borne out by the utterances of a number of British trade union leaders on behalf of international united action, and the statements in favor of accepting the proposal of the Communist International made by the prominent Swedish Social-Democrat, Georg Branting, and others.

In face of the daily growing danger of a world imperialist war, the Executive Committee of the Communist International, giving expression to the unquestionable desire for unity of the Communist and Social-Democratic workers, calls upon the workers of all countries to frustrate the resistance of the opponents of the united front and to put an end to the division of their forces in the fight against fascism and war.

Acting in conformity with the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, and declaring that the Communist International is ready at any moment to start negotiations on the question of united action, the Executive Committee of the Communist International calls upon all Communist Parties to increase their efforts tenfold in the struggle for the united front, and to establish the closest collaboration with all supporters of the united front in the ranks of the Labor and Socialist International for a joint struggle against fascism, imperialist war and the capitalist offensive.

Long live the great cause of the unity of the international proletariat!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The Italian War, United Working Class Action, and the Position of the Labor And Socialist International

By K. GOTTWALD

Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Communist International

THE armed aggression of Italian fascism upon the Ethiopian people constitutes a new and grave warning to the international working class. Let us remember that the preparations for this war took place during many months before the eyes of the world. They were preparations made with that callous cynicism of which only brutal fascism is capable.

The predatory nature of this war is obvious. Indignation at the

fascist aggression is universal, and there is general sympathy with the victims of this attack—the Ethiopian people. Yet Mussolini was able to undertake this sanguinary adventure, the results of which may be incalculable. The international proletariat has the right and the obligation to enquire *why* this could happen, and whether it was not possible to *prevent* the war.

In his final address at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, Comrade Dimitroff rejected the fatalistic view of the unavoidability of imperialist war, and stated:

“It is true that imperialist wars are the product of capitalism, that only the overthrow of capitalism will put an end to all war; *but it is likewise true that the toiling masses can obstruct imperialist war by their militant action.*”

Indeed yes—and it *would have been possible to prevent* even the present war in Africa. But the first and most important *preliminary condition* for this was *united action by working class organizations and militant action by the toiling masses*. In his telegram to the Labor and Socialist International on October 7, 1935, Comrade Dimitroff emphasized this in the following words:

“The international working class has been unable to prevent this war, just as it was unable to prevent German fascism coming to power, *because its organizations did not act unitedly and in solidarity. As a result, the working class was not in a position to launch a mighty people's movement of all peace-loving classes and peoples against the incendiaries of war, thus erecting an insurmountable wall against war.*”

How true this is! Let us for a moment suppose that there had been a *timely, joint* action by all working-class organizations, both in the various countries and on an international scale. Would that not have had a powerful influence upon all other sections of the population? Would that not have led millions of peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia—in short, the majority of the population—into a vast front for peace? And, if this great peace front had not remained content with mere appeals to the League of Nations, but *had also carried out independent anti-war activities—and, particularly, had made serious preparation for such action as would have led to the actual isolation of the fascist*

aggressor—who could assert that this would have been without influence upon the development of events? Impressed by such an international rallying of the forces for peace, Mussolini would have had to take thought a few times before giving his orders for the attack upon Ethiopia. Impressed by such an advance of the peace front, the various capitalist governments who are members of the League would have been compelled to take *opportune* and *effective* action against the fascist aggressor, which would have led to a *preventive* check upon his warlike aspirations. Unfortunately, however, such an advance of the peace front did not take place; and today humanity is confronted by the fact of a new and sanguinary war.

The Communist International issued its warning in due time; it sounded the alarm at the right moment; it extended in good time its hand to the Labor and Socialist International for joint action against war, in defense of peace. For example, it proposed to the L.S.I., before last May First, the holding of joint May Day demonstrations, with particular reference to the war danger in Ethiopia. As is well known, the whole Seventh Congress of the Communist International constituted a single burning appeal for united action by the working class. On September 25, when war loomed upon the horizon, the Communist International renewed its offer. And on October 7, when the first Italian bombs were being dropped upon Ethiopian villages, Comrade Dimitroff again telegraphed to the Secretariat of the L.S.I., as follows:

"Now that so much time has already been lost, it is all the more our duty and yours at this moment to put a stop to military action and prevent the war from spreading to other parts of the world. Any further delay in bringing about united action in the struggle against the war that has already begun would be fatal."

The Executive of the L.S.I. dealt with the offer of the Communist International on October 12—somewhat late, as it would appear. But better late than never. According to the official report, representatives were present from seventeen countries. Representatives of the majority of the parties declared themselves in favor of acceptance of the C.I.'s offer. Only the representatives of five parties were opposed. But, although a majority of parties were

in favor of the offer, although an unprecedented number of Socialist workers and organizations in various countries had demanded acceptance of the offer, although the Italian war was now in full course, thus rendering imperatively urgent the united action of the international proletariat—in spite of all this, the Executive of the L.S.I. decided *against acceptance*.

Who forced on this unfortunate decision? Who was it who again refused the hand outstretched to them, who made it impossible to establish unity of action among the working class at so critical an hour? Who assumed such heavy responsibility, and through their blacklegging—yes, I repeat, blacklegging!—action, encouraged all fascist war incendiaries to new murderous adventures? The official communique of the Executive of the L.S.I. itself places its finger upon these persons. It states as follows:

“As regards the invitation from the Communist International to meet four representatives appointed by that body, the Socialist Parties in Great Britain, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Czechoslovakia have stated that they cannot accept this invitation, on the one hand because of the composition of the delegation from the Communist International, and on the other hand because they reject any unity with the Communist Parties in their own countries and any joint action between the two Internationals.

“The Executive Committee of the L.S.I. is obliged to take into account the views of these great parties of the working class, and is therefore unable to accept the invitation of the Communist International.”

It was, therefore, the representatives of the British Labor Party and of the Social-Democratic Parties of Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Czechoslovakia, who again rendered impossible joint action by the two Internationals; and this at a juncture when blood is being shed, when it is a matter of saving the lives of tens of thousands of peaceful Ethiopian and Italian soldiers, of putting an end to this slaughter and preventing it from spreading to other parts of the world. These persons must be brought before the tribunal of the working class, and particularly before the tribunal of the membership of their own parties. Their names are as follows: J. Compton, G. Dallas, H. Dalton and W. Gillies, of Great Britain; J. Stivin, F. Soukup and A. Schäfer, of Czechoslovakia; J. W. Albarda and K. Vorrück, of Holland; Z. Hög-

lund and R. Lindström, of Sweden; V. W. Christensen, of Denmark.

How may one explain the attitude of these leaders in the five above-mentioned countries? For it is a fact that these same leaders adopt resolutions of protest against the Italian war in Ethiopia. It is a fact that they also express themselves as opposed to the war, and call for a drastic attitude toward the fascist aggressors. How, then, may we understand that they reject united action of the working class against the war? "To accept the offer of the Communist International would mean harming the labor movement in our country"—such is the gist of the arguments presented by those who talk about struggle against war, but reject unity in this struggle. Let us examine more closely this affair, and we shall be able to reveal what is concealed behind this black deed of the reactionary leaders.

In Great Britain we are on the eve of a general election. The Labor Party leaders are of the opinion that a united front with the Communists would "compromise" them in the eyes of the petty bourgeoisie and thus lessen the prospects of the Labor Party in the election. This is a completely fallacious argument. That which is compromising the Labor Party leaders in the eyes of the masses is their *policy*, which is following in the wake of the policy of the National Government, and their policy of division within the ranks of the workers. On the other hand, the establishment of united action of the British working class, the joint action of working-class organizations of all shades of opinion against war and the home and foreign policy of the National Government would—as in the case of France—bring the petty bourgeoisie over to the side of the workers, and would thus lead to a defeat of the National Government at the elections.

Why do not the leaders of the Labor Party—who have themselves issued the appeal for the defeat of the National Government and the establishment of a Labor Government—choose this simple and manifest course, which has been proposed to them by the British Communists? Why are they increasing the election prospects of the National Government by means of their policy of division among the workers and the support of British imperial-

ism? Simply because the Labor Party leaders do not wish to compromise themselves in the eyes of the British *bourgeoisie*, because they give preference to cooperation with the *bourgeoisie* over the establishment of united action of the proletariat.

In Czechoslovakia, the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party are members of a coalition government with the bourgeoisie. They say that, if they were to establish the united front with the Communists, they would have to resign from the government. It is quite true that the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie states the problem in these terms. But should that be a reason for maintaining the division within the working class in Czechoslovakia? The Czechoslovakian Social-Democratic Ministers and their supporters will tell you: "If we were to leave the government, the fascists would enter it; therefore we must do all we can to remain within it." Only a person who is hopelessly dependent upon the bourgeoisie can consider the question from this standpoint.

The working class of Czechoslovakia, with the establishment of joint action in their struggle, would find themselves in a position comparatively soon to rescue above all the toiling peasantry and the intelligentsia from the influence of the capitalists, and would possess sufficient power, not only to prevent the entry of the fascists into the government, but also to make a big step forward towards a government of the People's Front. Broad prospects are opened up before the toiling population of Czechoslovakia in this direction, whereas the policy pursued by the reactionary leaders of Czechoslovakia Social-Democracy is leading the working class into a blind ally.

Even today the reactionary part of the government coalition is more and more frequently banging its fist on the table and confronting the Social-Democratic leaders with the question: Eat or starve! If you don't want to follow us, you can go, others will come in your place. Yes, if things go on like this, if the Socialist workers and their organizations do not succeed in settling accounts with their reactionary leaders, then the fascists will indeed be able to come to power, and the split working class will not be able to prevent this. The prevention of a fascist dictatorship in Czechoslovakia can take place only by means of united action of the

working class, by means of the People's Front—as proposed by the Communists. Why do the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders reject these means? Simply because it would prejudice them in the eyes of the Czechoslovakian *bourgeoisie*, because it would imply the abandonment of the policy of cooperation with *the bourgeoisie*, and because, notoriously, for these people cooperation with the bourgeoisie is of more importance than the interests of the working class.

It is clearly evidenced by the foregoing that the reactionary elements in the leadership of the British Labor Party and of the Czechoslovakian Social-Democratic Parties—as well as their colleagues in Holland, Denmark and Sweden—through their repeated rejection of the offers made by the Communist International—are sabotaging not only the struggle of the *international proletariat* against war, but also the struggle for the immediate interests of the *working masses in their own countries*. They place the maintenance of cooperation with the bourgeoisie higher than the interests of the proletariat. Their procedure can be explained in this way, and in no other.

And to what does this lead? To write against war, and at the same time to prevent the workers and their organizations from uniting in joint action against war—who can benefit from this? Obviously, only the fascist war-makers. On the one hand to shout about the defeat of the National Government in England and on the other hand to sail along in the wake of this National Government and render impossible the united action of the working class against it and its policy—who profits by this? Obviously, no one but the reactionary National Government and the English fascists. To say you want to stop the fascists coming to power in Czechoslovakia, but at the same time to serve those who are conspiring with the fascists and on the other hand to offer furious opposition to the workers' united front—who benefits from this? Obviously, all enemies of the toiling people.

* * *

It is with satisfaction that one can state that there were persons on the Executive of the Labor and Socialist International who

spoke in favor of the acceptance of the proposals of the Communist International. This is a victory for all those who desire unity of action of the working class, and who fight for its achievement. It proves that the conception of united action and the joint struggle is continually gaining ground, even among the Socialist *leaders*. We welcome every step taken by these leaders along the path towards the united front and genuine unity of action, which is nowadays the demand of millions; and we shall support them in this. But precisely in the interests of this cause is it necessary to refer publicly to the *weaknesses* which characterized the attitude of those who spoke, through the Executive of the L.S.I., in favor of acceptance of the C.I.'s proposals.

How can a Socialist worker—an honest supporter of united action—understand it, when you declare in favor of the acceptance of something, of the correctness of which you are convinced, and then ultimately vote in favor of a resolution which rejects your own proposal? And all the more so, when the majority has been in favor of your proposal? For this is how it was in the Executive of the L.S.I.: seventeen parties were represented, according to the official report, and of these five were against accepting the offer of the C.I. while the others were in favor; nevertheless the resolution rejecting this offer was adopted unanimously, with only one delegate abstaining. Does it not seem to you that there is a lack of consistency here? It cannot be called consistency when you consistently capitulate as soon as the opponents of the united front bang their fist on the table.

You extenuate your retreat before the opponents of united action by means of the following sentence in the Executive's resolution:

"The Executive of the L.S.I. is obliged to take into account the views of these great parties of the working class and is therefore unable to accept the invitation of the Communist International."

Does it not appear to you that the supporters of united action within the ranks of the L.S.I.—and you know as well as we do that among these may be counted many members of those parties whose leaders rejected the proposals of the C.I.—might well be entitled to ask why the Executive only took into consideration the

views of the *opponents* of the united front, and did not trouble itself regarding the views of the *supporters*? Particularly as these latter represent a *majority*. Have we not here a case of the reactionary minority *dictating* to the majority? After all, it surprises no one that the reactionary leaders should wish to impose their standpoint—which is damaging to the working class of the entire world—at any cost, even by dictatorial means. In their own countries they employ similar methods against their own membership. But it is indeed astonishing when you fail to condemn this reactionary dictatorial method, but, on the contrary, excuse it and justify it.

Perhaps you will here raise the objection: If the Executive had accepted the proposal of the C.I. against the will of the leaders of those five parties, it would have involved the splitting of the L.S.I. and you wanted to prevent that. But since when has the right to veto existed in any working-class organization? In such a case, the particular organization would have been hamstrung from the beginning, and rendered incapable of action. Any particular person could stand up and declare: "If things don't go according to my desire, I will break up the organization." And if the others, the majority, always gave way before a threat of this kind and stated: "All right, it shall be according to your desire, so long as we can remain together with you"—what would be the ultimate result? That they would finally become the "fifth wheel of the cart"—of no account whatever.

Perhaps you are right when you maintain that the Executive of the L.S.I., had they accepted the proposals of the C.I., was not in a position to compel the leadership of the particular five parties concerned to work together with the Communist Parties in their respective countries; although we are of the opinion that such a decision of the L.S.I. would have expressed the desire of the majority of Socialist workers, even in those particular countries, would have strengthened their struggle for united action of the working class and, eventually, would have compelled the leadership of those parties to adopt a different, a favorable attitude. At the present time there exists, within the L.S.I., the "right of jurisdiction", if one may so express it, according to which each

party may decide *for itself* whether it takes part in the united front or not. In the resolution of the L.S.I. Executive, of October 12, 1935, it is quite clearly stated:

"But as the resolution of the Executive Committee of the L.S.I. of November 17, 1934, in which it gave its affiliated parties the right to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to establish united action with the Communist Parties of their respective countries is still in force. . . ."

Very well, then! Even if we admit that the Belgian, de Brouckère, is not in a position to compel the Dutchman, Albarda, to adopt the united front in Holland, nothing stands in de Brouckère's way to prevent him from proposing and bringing about unity of action in Belgium, within his own party. Even if we realize that the Austrian, Otto Bauer, cannot persuade the Czechoslovak, Stivin, to place no obstacles in the way of the united front in Czechoslovakia, we still cannot comprehend why Otto Bauer—who, in his latest article, has declared himself to be in favor also of the united front "in world politics"—still hesitates with regard to the establishment of the united front in Austria. It is true that Wels, the German, does not possess the means of compelling Dalton, the Englishman, to agree to unity of action of the working class in Great Britain, but he certainly does possess sufficient power and influence to bring about the united front, from within the German Social-Democratic Party, in Germany. You friends, who in Brussels declared in favor of the acceptance of the proposals of the C.I.—this is now things stand:

You have declared yourselves to be in favor of the acceptance of the proposals of the C.I. This is excellent—this is in the interests of the cause of the working class. We recognize your attitude, and welcome it. But you have voted for a resolution which rejects your own proposals. That is already not too good. If you will allow us to say so; it is inconsistent, and we cannot agree with it. But let it be so. You explain your retreat by saying that the opponents of the united front were not in accord with you, and that you must take into account their opinion. It is, of course, quite right to take into account the opinions of others. But to submit to an opinion with which one is in disagreement is not

right, and it is even less right to *excuse* and *justify* a standpoint with which one disagrees. But let it be so. You will object that the Executive of the L.S.I.—even if they had taken a favorable attitude with regard to the C.I. invitation—do not possess the influence and power to enforce this standpoint upon those five parties whose leaders had declared themselves adversely. This is indeed unfortunate, and we regret it; but so be it. But the point is that we should meet now on territory where the reactionary opponents of the united front cannot stop us, namely, *in your own countries*. These people have temporarily defeated *international* unity. We shall continue to fight ceaselessly for international unity of action. And we shall achieve it most rapidly if we establish the united front in the *individual countries*, as we have in France. Logically, all those Socialist Parties whose representatives declared in favor of accepting the C.I.'s invitation at the L.S.I. Executive meeting, should follow the example of the Socialist Party of France. All the more so, as the resolution of your own International gives you this right, and the decision rests entirely with you.

* * *

In its rejection of the offer of the C.I., the Executive of the L.S.I. refers to the fact that it has itself decided upon the necessary steps to be taken against the war. In the resolution, it states:

“At the joint conference held on October 12, 1935, the Executive Committee of the L.S.I., in complete agreement with the I.F.T.U., decided to adopt a number of measures for the successful conduct of the struggle against the attack of Italian fascism on Ethiopia and against the war danger in Europe.”

What are these measures? The resolution of the Executive of the L.S.I. in the first place expresses its satisfaction that the League of Nations has declared Italy to be the aggressor. In the second place, it demands that the League apply “immediate effective sanctions” against the aggressor. Third, it assures the League of “the most effective support of its organizations in the application of sanctions”. Fourth, it desires that the League inform Mussolini and his government that “on account of their aggression,

they shall obtain no benefits from the final peace treaty". And the resolution of the L.S.I. Executive *concludes* with the assurance that the L.S.I. and the I.F.T.U. "place the moral strength of the workers and the power of their organizations at the disposal of the League of Nations for the defense of peace and of justice". And—that is all!

What do all these "measures" amount to? To calling upon the *League of Nations* to do this or that; to supporting the *League of Nations* if it does this or that: to placing the working-class organizations at the disposition of the *League of Nations*, for this or that purpose. *This means that the whole struggle against war is made dependent upon the League of Nations. The working-class movement of the world, the international people's movement against war and for peace, is thus degraded to the position of an appendage or servant of the League of Nations.*

We could at least understand the position of the L.S.I. Executive if the League of Nations would give minimum guarantees that it would defend the cause of peace at all times and everywhere, in every case and in spite of all consequences. It is quite true that the League is no longer the same as it was—let us say—five years ago. The Soviet Union, the sole working-class state in the world, is now a member of the League. Two of the chief war-mongering states—fascist Germany and militarist Japan—are now outside it. The third war-mongering state, fascist Italy, has been declared by the League to be the aggressor. It is true that, within the League, a front has now been established of those capitalist states which, for one reason or another, desire no new war for the redivision of the world. All that is true. In spite of all this, however, the League of Nations remains an association *in which the capitalist and imperialist powers have the majority*—and the international working class *cannot* leave its fate, and the fate of peace, in the hands of such elements. For this reason, the standpoint of the L.S.I. Executive, which is forcing the international working-class movement precisely *in this direction*, is incomprehensible and incorrect. It is as if one were to counsel a wayfarer to follow a will-o'-the-wisp. To what would we be sending him? To the quagmire, to ruin!

Naturally, we Communists also *wish* that the League of Nations apply all financial and economic sanctions against fascist Italy and against any other imperialist incendiary. Naturally, we Communists do not reject the instruments of *pressure*, either upon the various governments or upon the League itself, by means of which we can *force* them to act as the people demand. But what has the strongest influence upon the gentlemen of the various cabinets, as well as upon their representatives in Geneva? The L.S.I. leaders tell the workers: Write and pass resolutions so that your governments and the League of Nations decide upon sanctions against Italy—and the thing is settled. If this were actually the fact, the whole matter would be exceedingly simple. Unfortunately, however, it is not so simple as all that. Already very many resolutions have been passed, but Mussolini continues to carry on his war; and continues to receive from abroad war materials and other goods which he can use for war purposes.

Is it not true that the method of purely *declaratory* demands upon the various capitalist governments, as well as upon the League, does not possess the necessary effectiveness? Is it not evident that the international working class must choose *another* method? That it must, upon the one hand, paralyze the fascist aggressor by means of its own power, while, upon the other hand, it simultaneously compels, through these activities of its own, the governments and the League to take serious and effective measures against the fascist aggressor? And this method is *the united, independent action against war and in favor of peace of workers of all shades of opinion and of all opponents of war*. And, in particular, all those measures which the working-class organizations shall decide upon and operate in fulfilment of the slogan that: *Not a single train, not a single ship, intended to assist the Italian war in Ethiopia, shall be allowed to move*. If we are to influence the capitalist governments and the League of Nations—in which there is a capitalist majority—we must confront them with *accomplished facts, achieved through the power of proletarian action*, for it is only thus that they can be compelled to take effective action on behalf of peace. Only then will the international working class movement be *no appendage or servant of*

the League of Nations, but will become the *driving power*, exerting an effective influence over the development of events.

But it is precisely with regard to this most important point—the *independent anti-war action of the workers*—that neither the L.S.I. nor the I.F.T.U. has formed any concrete decisions. And the more irresponsible does their rejection of the C.I.'s proposal for joint anti-war action become. It amounts to avoiding any anti-war action whatever.

* * *

There can be no question that the reactionary L.S.I. leaders, owing to their rejection of joint action by the two Internationals, have dealt a severe blow at the world movement against war and have encouraged all the fascist war-mongers to go forward to new sanguinary enterprises, and thus have burdened themselves with a heavy responsibility before the working class of the entire world. But the opponents of the united front are deceiving themselves if they believe their rejection has finally settled the question of international unity of action. By no means! This question is going to be raised by millions and millions of people. A few reactionary leaders can delay and render more difficult its successful solution, but they cannot frustrate it. The question of international unity of action will be solved—and in a positive sense!

Within the L.S.I. the number of supporters of the united front is continually growing. This is proved by the fact that the representatives of only five parties possessed the sorry courage openly to take a negative stand in this grave situation. But even within these five parties, there are not a few supporters of the united front, and in them also resistance is growing to the clique of reactionary leaders. It is imperative that all those who desire the united action of the workers concentrate their forces on joint efforts to accomplish the purpose of the supporters of unity within the Socialist Parties. The working class cannot for long tolerate the fact that a few reactionary leaders break their ranks in this grave historical moment.

As a result of the disruptive activity and the sabotage of the opponents of the united front, the anti-war action of the toiling masses is not developing as is necessary. The supporters of peace

and of united action must therefore redouble their efforts. As, for the time being, we have not arrived at an agreement of the two Internationals on the question of international action against war—owing to the opposition of the representatives of five parties—this must be put into effect on a national and local scale. And not only is an agreement necessary, but also an *active* movement.

Every supporter of peace must realize the following: If international public opinion, if all peace-loving classes and peoples do not now set up a powerful resistance to the Italian war-mongers in their bloody operations, the war-mongers in other parts of the world will be encouraged soon to follow suit, and thus will the present war in Ethiopia become the prelude to a new world war. In order that this may not come to pass, it is necessary that unity of action of the working class be realized, *at all costs*, in every locality, in every country and over the whole world. The whole international Communist movement must strive for this daily, tirelessly, resolutely, irrespective of all obstacles. We shall never give up! The international united action of the working class will become a fact!

Read More About
THE UNITED FRONT

in Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen, Wash.: 115½ West
Heron St.

Akron: 365 South Main St.
Baltimore: 501-A North Eutaw St.

Boston: 216 Broadway

Buffalo: 65 West Chippewa

Butte: 119 Hamilton St.

Cambridge: 6½ Holyoke St.

Camden: 304 Federal St.

Chicago: 161 North Franklin St.

2135 West Division St.

1326 East 57th St.

200 West Van Buren

Cincinnati: 540 Main St.

Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.

Dayton: 712 Wayne Ave.

Denver: 522 Exchange Bldg.

Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.

Duluth: 114 West First St.

Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.

Hollywood: 1116 No. Lillian Way

Los Angeles: 224 So. Spring St.

230 S. Spring St.

2411½ Brooklyn Ave.

321 West Second St.

Madison, Wisc.: 312 W. Gorham

Milwaukee: 419 West State St.

Minneapolis: 241 Marquette Ave.

Newark: 847 Broad St., 3rd fl.

New Haven: 280 Park St.

New York: 50 East 13th St.

112 West 44th St.

140 Second Ave.

115 W. 135th St., Harlem

1001 Prospect Ave., Bronx

1337 Wilkins Ave., Bronx

2050 Wallace Ave., Bronx

369 Sutter Ave., Brooklyn

4531 16th Ave., Brooklyn

Omaha: 311 Karbach Block

Oakland: 419 12th St.

Paterson: 201 Market St.

Philadelphia: 104 South 9th St.

118 W. Allegheny Ave.

4023 Girard Ave.

2404 Ridge Ave.

Pittsburgh: 1638 Fifth Ave.

Portland, Ore.: 314 S. W. Madison St.

Providence: 335 Westminster St.,

Room 42

Reading: 224 North Ninth

Richmond, Va.: 202 N. First St.,

2nd floor

Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.

St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.

St. Paul: 600 Wabasha St.

Salt Lake City: 415 Hooper Bldg.

San Diego: 635 E St.

San Francisco:

170 Golden Gate Ave.

1609 O'Farrell St.

121 Haight St.

San Pedro: 244 West 6th St.

Santa Barbara:

208 W. Canon Perdido

Seattle: 713½ Pine St.

4217 University Way

Spokane: West 9 Riverside

Superior: 601 Tower Ave.

Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.

Toledo: 214 Michigan

Washington, D.C.: 513 F St., N.W.

Youngstown: 310 W. Federal St.

*Write for a complete catalog to
any of the above addresses or to*

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City