

THE

# RED FLAG

Organ of the Communist League of Great Britain

NUMBER 10. VOL. I

ONE PENNY.

AUGUST, 1934.

## THREAT TO TROTSKY!

A communication from French comrades reveals a serious threat to the life of Leon Trotsky, at present a virtual prisoner of the recently constituted, reactionary Doumergue Government. This Government's attempt to expel Comrade Trotsky was temporarily abandoned in the face of the unanimous refusal of every capitalist government to grant asylum.

Fascist and Royalist organisations are now attempting to force the hand of the Government to procure Trotsky's deportation to one of the French settlement islands. They are uttering thinly veiled threats to his life: the same organisations were responsible for the assassination of Jean Jaures, the French Socialist leader on the eve of the last war. The French Communist Party has played, in all the agitation around Comrade Trotsky's stay in France a thoroughly discreditable part, having joined in the cry - with the reactionaries and Fascists - for his deportation. It is curious that while Muzenbourg and other German Communist leaders can remain in Paris and go freely about their business, the leader of the Communist League should be threatened with deportation.

Trotsky's services to the Russian Revolution were considerable; his services to the world proletariat and to the cause of revolution have been even greater during the last few years. All who have read his writings on Germany know how closely his analysis and predictions were borne out by the events themselves and how his criticisms of the German Social Democrats and the German Communist Party, made long before Hitler's victory, are increasingly accepted now as the only clear explanation for the collapse of the German workers.

The same events have played havoc with the traducers of Trotsky. With what scorn and denunciation were Trotsky's warnings and his advocacy of the united front between Social Democracy and Communism received by the Communist International and the Communist Parties of our's and other countries! Today they seek desperately for this united front in their own words "at any price". With what contempt did they refer to Trotsky's advice to liquidate the "Red Unions"; now they are trying hard to make the workers forget that they ever existed. Trotsky's exposure of the uselessness of the Anti-war Movement, received with such hostility and, even by friends, with doubts, has been so far confirmed that even its own sponsors seek to abandon it.

To-day Leon Trotsky stands out as the best and greatest living expression and exponent of the world proletarian revolution. That is why the workers everywhere must hasten to his aid, for in the Fascist threat to his life is expressed the Fascist threat to working class revolutionary ideas. We urge our supporters to get to work at

once: in the trade union branches resolutions should be passed, not only to the French embassy protesting against the measures threatened against Trotsky, but to the T.U.C. General Council demanding that they take this matter up with the Government to grant Trotsky - and others in a similar position - the right of asylum. Labour M.P.'s should be asked to raise this question in the House of Commons. This fight for the right of asylum in the case of Comrade Trotsky is obviously a fight for a right which many hundreds of Communists and Socialist workers need and have failed to obtain. Had the British Communist Party taken up the demand for Trotsky's admission many of its own German comrades would not have been turned back so easily at the customs.

## Labour and War

The Labour Party statement on war is not yet available in full text. The Communist League will issue shortly a full criticism of this statement together with its own proposals, or the workers fight against war.

At the Labour Party Conference in 1933 the resolution passed committed the Labour Party to "take no part in war and to resist it with the whole force of the Labour movement and to seek consultation with the Trades Union and Co-operative Movements with a view to deciding and announcing to the country what steps, including a general strike, are to be taken to organise the opposition of the organised working class movement in the event of war or threat of war".

The result of this consultation was the statement, summarised in the Daily Herald for June 29th. The Labour Party Executive did not consult the Trades Union and Co-operative movements along the lines laid down at Hastings: they consulted with the object of ditching the Hastings Resolution. Mr. Henderson, of the Disarmament Conference has triumphed over the Labour Party Conference.

**THE STATEMENT MUST BE DEFEATED.** It must be defeated with full and conscious understanding by the workers that the fight against war demands readiness to carry through determined struggle against the Government prosecuting the war, the achieving of its overthrow and the winning of power for the workers.

## A NEW BOOK

We have received from the Hogarth Press "The Secret of Hitler's victory" by P. and I. Petroff, (3/6). It reached us too late for review in this issue but will receive full treatment in our next. A glance over the book reveals that although a short, limited sketch it gives a useful, interesting picture of weaknesses within both Communist and Socialist Parties which made Hitler's victory possible and the outline provided enables useful lessons to be drawn.

(continued from page 4.)

There have been revolutionary upheavals in every country in Europe during the last ten years but we can search the Comintern press in vain for signs of great upheavals in Italy when Fascism as ruled for so long. As for Germany, Dutt's boast of the German Communist Party's growing influence is about as true as were his claims put forward before Hitler's victory. No, the victory of the workers does not require the preliminary coming to power of Fascism: victory will be delayed not hastened by such an event.

Naturally Dutt tells us that only the C.I. is leading the fight against Fascism. Unfortunately, in spite of this assurance, a glance at the workers movement in this country will show that there is little work being done. To place the responsibility for this upon the Labour Party is, in general, correct, but revolutionaries cannot be content with putting forward correct generalisations - they must show the way forward.

The C.P.G.B.'s policy offers no way forward. The Anti-war Movement, where is that today? Just a few days back the C.P. proposed its liquidation. The Anti-Fascist Congress of 1933: what has that done in the fight against Fascism? Even the 'mighty' Bermondsey Congress of Action, the latest effort, represents nothing.

The lesson is clear: the task of the revolutionaries, in the absence of any authoritative mass revolutionary party, is the driving forward of the existing movement, the formulation of its immediate tasks and the winning of workers to the fight for these, in assisting the development of militant expression in the ranks of the organised workers. The contradiction between the needs of the masses and the policies of the leaders provides revolutionaries with the basis to group around them the best of the reformist workers.

We have given this space to "Fascism and Social Revolution" and to its author, not only because of the importance of the problems discussed, but also because R. P. Dutt expresses most clearly the weaknesses of the present day Communist International. Dutt has given useful service to the revolution in the past but the revolution and the Comintern have long parted company. No man can serve two masters: those who elect to serve Stalin must pay the price for such service. Unquestioning obedience, the sacrifice of every principle, the cowardly flight from discussion, the justification of every treachery and failure, such service works havoc with the integrity of the revolutionary and brings, as is the case of Dutt, steady deterioration and decline.

We can leave to the petty bourgeois "communist" the job of circulating Dutt's book: we ourselves have the task of repairing the damage done to the cause of Lenin by the present-day politics of Dutt and the International he serves.

R. G.

15th July, 1934.

# Fascism, Labour & the Communist Party

R. P. Dutt's book, "Fascism and Social Revolution" is the most able presentation to date of the Communist party's present day policy and its first serious theoretical examination of Fascism. It therefore merits consideration and presents as well a suitable occasion for examination of the authors position in the revolutionary movement.

One-time editor of the Workers' Weekly and editor of the Labour Monthly from 1921 to date, Dutt is the only competent theoretician in the C.P.G.B. For many years the younger revolutionaries and left wingers listened eagerly to his counsel followed with conviction the forward policy advocated in his 'Notes of the Month', learning from them a Marxism applied to living issues. The decline of the "Labour Monthly" during the last five or six years, a decline in quality, in circulation and in influence, is undoubtedly due to the deadening effect of the Comintern leadership over the British Communist Party and to the disastrous results of the ultra-left swing enforced by the Comintern in 1928-29.

During the early years of the C.P.G.B., notably during the period from 1924 to 1928, R. P. Dutt stood to the left of the British Communist leadership. It is doubtful if any of them but Dutt understood Lenin's advice to the British Communists set out in "Left Wing Communism" or grasped the inner mechanics of British Labour's development. All of them drifted buoyantly to the right, being aided in this by the policy of the Comintern throughout those very years. Dutt alone understood the significance of Lenin's teaching. The others knew only those quotations which excused their headlong plunge into reformist politics; Dutt saw the treachery inherent in the whole development of reformism; this it was which led to the "Notes of the Month" being so eagerly followed by the younger communists, for in them alone was the difference between revolutionary and reformist clearly stated.

This naturally led to continual conflict between Dutt and the official Party policy. The Party policy at that time was to place Labour in power and to transform the existing trade union and Labour movement into instruments of revolution. The Comintern's attempt at that time to drive the British revolution forward through the inner circles of the Trade Union Congress fitted harmoniously into the whole scheme.

The subordination of the Party to the "Lefts" on the T.U.C. General Council, and in the Labour Party evoked continual criticism by Dutt, either through inner party discussion or, obliquely through the "Notes of the Month". For example the "Communist International" (nos. 8 & 12) contains a semi-concealed attack by Dutt on the policy then being pursued. His use of the "Labour Monthly" to attack official party policy caused the leaders much uneasiness and an attack upon A. J. Cook during the miner's 'lock-out', when the entire Communist press were engaged in hiding from the workers Cook's weaknesses, brought him censure from the Party. Some time after, the Cook-Maxton "Socialist Revival" campaign received bitter and crushing criticism from Dutt precisely when the leaders of the C.P.G.B. were engaged in secret negotiations with Cook, Wheatley and Maxton and writing the pamphlet

afterwards issued as the programme of the Cook-Maxton movement!

The Leninist line of Dutt led him to give wholehearted welcome in the pages of the Labour Monthly to Trotsky's "Where is Britain Going?". This book, Trotsky says, was aimed essentially at "the official conception" of the Comintern leadership with its hopes of "an evolution to the left by the British General Council and the painless penetration of Communism into the British Labour Party". It is quite understandable that the British Party leaders should not comprehend this but it is incredible that Dutt, who a few months before had himself been attacking the "official conception", should not see clearly the purpose of the book. He not only saw it: he openly welcomed it and expressed the hope that Trotsky would not "stay his hand at this short sketch but will carry forward his work of interpretation, polemic and elucidation".

It is of interest too that one of the few well informed and sympathetic accounts of the Opposition's fight in the Russian Party against bureaucracy appeared, unsigned, in the Labour Monthly. It may also be noted that Dutt himself reviewed Max Eastman's "Since Lenin Died" (an account of this struggle) and did no more than attack the non-Marxist approach of the writer and disassociate Trotsky from the book, an attitude taken at the time by Trotsky himself and by most oppositionists.

## DUTT AND THE 'LEFTS'

Between 1923 and 1928 Dutt did good work by his revolutionary criticism of the reformists and the centrists, and by his insistence on the special character of the Communist Party's work as distinguished from the wider 'left wing'. Those not associated with the movement at this time and who know only the C.P.G.B.'s fervid present day polemics will find it hard to appreciate the value of this work and to realise how much it was directed against the whole current of contemporary communist policy. These were the days of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the days when the C.P.G.B. was deeply entrenched in the Labour movement, when its members were also members of the Labour Party and controlled scores of local branches, when Communists stood as Labour candidates and the C.I. paid the election and publicity expenses of 'Left' trade union leaders and when practically all the leading Socialist journals and leaders hid their reformist ideas behind a militant vocabulary Dutt saw through this more clearly than most and based practically all his writings on the inadequacy of Left wing Labourism to the revolutionary needs of the time.

Dutt's swift reaction to events, his quick mind, his brilliant pen were an indubitable asset throughout the years in which the Communist Party was closely linked with the mass organisations of the workers. During this time Dutt was compelled to relate revolutionary analysis and theory to the life of the mass movement and to its immediate needs. The change in Communist policy in 1928 free him from the hampering realities of the slow steady development of the political thought of the masses. Isolated from the heavy battalions of labour, Dutt's assets become mirrors through which are reflected the chief tact-

cal errors of present day Communist party policy. The more pronounced the leitism of the C.I., the more the leaders of the C.P.G.B. floundered in the bog of misunderstanding, the more urgent Dutt felt the need for the strongest possible emphasis, the more ferociously he denounced alike the faint-hearted, the doubting the cautious, and the more rapidly he outpaced the masses.

Dutt is credited with having once declared - during the early days of the Russian Revolution - that with two hundred intelligent trained communists the British Revolution could be effected. Whether or not this be true, Dutt's present day attitude is more akin to that than to his revolutionary position during the pre-1928 days and more closely resembles the impatient intellectual brushing aside the wider problems of the mass organisations than the brilliant interpreter of Lenin's famous advice to British Communists. Today Dutt sees as clearly as ever the sharp outlines, detects the crisis-bringing factors at work beneath every apparent improvement in capitalism's position, and exposes relentlessly every tie that binds reformism to capitalism. But the more immediate and changing factors: the moods, the point reached, the responses, the ebbs as well as the flow of the masses in movement are either ignored or viewed as the invention of defeatists.

Dutt relies solely upon the objective maturity of the present social conditions and upon the automatic response of the masses to those conditions. He ignores, that is, the subjective factor which in our time is all important. Every sharp turn in the political situation puts tremendous responsibility upon the Party. This too does not exist for Dutt who assumes that the general correctness of Communist theory justifies the ultra-left deduction from it and even when the results reveal otherwise Dutt is, it seems, chained too securely ever to say so.

## HYSTERIA NOT POLICY

The result is the opposite to that sought after. The top note sounded every month becomes wearisome: the too frequent cry of alarm brings, not alertness or response but scepticism, or else a fatalism equally dangerous. It satisfies only the petty bourgeois member of the Communist Party for such takes the place of influence and position in the mass movement. It enables the petty bourgeois to substitute for serious patient work in the reformist organisations an uninterrupted demonstration, a dashing backwards and forwards warning the heedless workers, setting up hosts of unrepresentative committees which come and go with bewildering rapidity leaving not a rack behind. All the symptoms of the present day Communist Party, its political stunts, exaggerated forecast and equally exaggerated account, its lies, its unscrupulous distortion and misrepresentation, these find their highest expression, if one can use the term in this connection, in the writings of R. P. Dutt.

The rapid divorce of Dutt from the realities of the actual situation in Britain can best be seen in his writings. In these writings, spread over 13 years, there are many incorrect statements and unfulfilled predictions: it would be remarkable if there were not. Full credit must be given to

# -The Rise and Decline of R.P. Dutt

Dutt for placing before the workers a perspective which in outline has been more than justified by subsequent events. We shall not deal here with mistakes in tempo or in detail. Rather shall we take the outstanding miscalculation to be found in the writings of Dutt, one that affects considerably the book under review.

Throughout the period of C.P.G.B. support for the Labour Party there was a marked danger of the growth of reformism within the Communist Party, a danger of the blurring of the difference between reformism and communism. Dutt realised this and subjected each stage, each event, to analysis; corrected the optimism of the leftwing workers concerning the left leaders and kept before his readers the real needs and tasks of the time. Towards the end of this period the accumulated errors of the Party leadership and the collapse of the left wing necessitated a re-statement of the position. The expulsion of Communists from the Labour Party emphasised this need. The younger members of the Party were in revolt against the complacent bureaucracy of the C.P.G.B., against the marked variance between Communist theory and Communist practice and against the losses accruing to the Party from the General Strike. This revolt coincided with the ultra-left turn in the C.I.; a development fully analysed by L. D. Trotsky in his "Strategy of the World Revolution.

## POLLITT-DUTT THESIS

R.P. Dutt's long record as a critic of centrism added prestige to the thesis which he and Pollitt set forward in opposition to the majority of the C.P.G.B. Central Committee who were in favour of a continuance, under very unsatisfactory conditions, of the old policy. Dutt's attitude and the turn of the C.I. diverted what might have been an important change inside the C.P.G.B. into ultra-leftist channels.

The Dutt-Pollitt statement declared that in view of the changes in the situation resulting from the Labour Government of 1924 and the General Strike of 1926, the "repeated exposure of the reformist leadership in every field", the "leftward advance" of the workers, and the increasing mass influence of the Communist Party, Lenin's advice of 1920 need no longer be the basis of policy.

Lenin, in 1920, urged that Labour be placed in power. This, Dutt and Pollitt argued, had been done, and the consequent "exposure" of the Labour Party presented the Communist Party with a great opportunity for growth. Their statement spoke of the "process of revolutionisation" amongst the working class, of "increasing division between the mass of the workers and the reformist leadership", of the Communist Party's position of "very considerable mass influence and contact", of a worker's press with "a steady working class circulation of over 50,000" and of access, through the Minority Movement, to "over a million sympathetic in the trade unions". They pointed to the Municipal Elections of 1927 as showing "the beginning of a decline in the Labour vote in the industrial areas. The industrial working class are losing faith in the Labour Party" and argued that a change of policy would "bring new strength to the party, awaken new interest and new enthusiasm" among the workers, "bring an ever-increasing accession of support and membership to the Party". How little have these claims been justified!

What wouldn't Dutt and Pollitt give to-day for access to a million sympathisers in the trade unions and for a 50,000 circulation for their press?

In the Labour Monthly for February 1928 Dutt again declared that the Labour Party vote was beginning to decline: "The Labour Party is losing its hold on the industrial working class... for the leadership which can realise this advance... a great accession of strength is waiting". In October 1928 Dutt wrote: "A process is set going by which the Labour Party builds increasingly on the petty bourgeoisie while the Communist Party becomes established as the mass party of the industrial workers".

But in the following year, 1929, the workers returned a Labour Government with an increased vote of nearly 3 millions. Dutt commented: "The mass of the workers voted Labour in the GREAT INDUSTRIAL CENTRES AND MINING AREAS" with "... overwhelming solidarity". But in another article he observed that the Communist Party was in a "politically strong position to press forward the fight against the Labour Government and gain strength from the exposure".

How far did this happen? Let Dutt himself answer. In December 1930 he wrote: "Revolutionary Marxism has still NO CONTACT with the main body of the workers, is still only on the fringes of the working class, has no hold IN THE FACTORIES AND CENTRES OF INDUSTRY, apart from a few mining centres where development has gone further". What, it may well be asked, has become of the "million sympathisers in the unions", of the increasing support from the industrial areas; of the results of the exposure of the Labour Government carried on with such passionate fervour during this period? It needs also to be remembered that from January 1930 the C.P.G.B. had the advantage of a daily newspaper.

## STILL DECLINING

Still, however, no realisation that the drastic policy change might account for the weaknesses and the decline. On the contrary the fashion was to press the new policy still more strongly. Dutt hailed the 1931 election as a great vindication of his attitude. This election saw a big drop in the Labour vote, although due account had to be taken for the decrease in the constituencies fought and for the circumstances of the election. Actually the Labour vote, allowing for these things, stood astonishingly solid: the Communist increase was very small. A revolutionary more responsive to the changes in the situation would have reflected on this. Not so Dutt. Brushing aside the unexplained features, the qualifying factors he proclaimed once more: "The beginning of the decline of the Labour Party... Disillusionment with the Labour Party has reached a proportion affecting millions of workers... The Labour Party begins, for the first time since its post war expansion, to go downwards". The significant feature of the election results, declared Dutt, was "the decline of the Labour Party... The disillusionment of the workers has been swift... the rising curve (of the Labour vote) has ended... a smashing blow had been dealt at 'the whole system of parliamentarianism and the Labour Party... the independent worker's movement is rising". By this time Lenin's advice was not only out of date: to have brought it forward would have been the vilest heresy.

Yet one more quotation, completing the six years of Dutt on the Labour Party. In the "Notes of Month" for June 1934 Dutt writes: "Unseeing, unthinking, the mass of the workers are pouring to the return of a Labour Government to get rid of the hated National Government. Hammer smith showed it. The Communist Party DOES NOT YET WIN THE SUPPORT OF MORE THAN A FRACTION OF THE WORKERS".

The above survey shows clearly enough how Dutt's political weaknesses have increasingly dominated his writing. It reveals also that Dutt's estimate of Labour, the swing of the workers away from Labour to the Communist Party, based as it was upon automatic processes, has been proved false. The "independent revolutionary policy" which was to bring masses to communism has actually driven masses away and resulted in a temporary strengthening of the Labour Party.

In spite of these continued failures Dutt seems too far steeped in the Comintern policies of the last few years to be able to cut his way through to a real appreciation of the present situation. "Fascism and Social Revolution" gives convincing proof of this.

The earlier chapters of this book show that Fascism arises out of the whole economic and cultural decay of modern capitalism is, in fact, the most complete political expression of this decay. Dutt sketches the outstanding points in the whole preceding period, showing especially how capitalism stabilised itself through the treachery of Social Democracy. This section of the book is of especial interest and value to those newly entered into working class politics.

## THE BOOK

The book must be judged by the value of its contribution to the understanding of Fascism, the relation of Social Democracy to Fascism and to Communism in the fight against Fascism. Before dealing with this section of the book we must first point to two significant omissions.

There is no reference to the part played by the German Communist Party in the stabilisation of capitalism in Germany. Dutt makes great play of the fact that the policy of the Social Democrats in the 1918 revolution and after made inevitable the losses suffered by the workers: he characteristically ignores the fact that in the crisis of 1923 the German Communist Party could have taken power, for at that time the workers were flocking to its banner and deserting the Social Democrats, whilst the Fascist movement as a serious factor did not exist. The German Communist Party drew back at the decisive time, thus strengthening in the ensuing period Social Democracy and creating widespread lack of confidence in the Communist leadership. Dutt does not mention this. Neither, naturally, does he show the part played by Stalin in this retreat. Stalin's notorious 1923 letter, urging the German Communists to retreat deserves as important a place in an indictment of policies as any Social Democrat's documents or writings. Once one admits such things much of Dutt's pounding full-throated denunciation begins to sound a trifle insincere. The second omission is that nowhere in the whole book is there a single reference to the writings of Leon Trotsky on Fascism. This

is remarkable since the whole controversy around C.I. policy on Fascism in Germany and Austria and indeed in every country, has centred round the criticisms made by Trotsky. From 1929 onwards Trotsky submitted the situation in Austria and in Germany and the policies of Communism and Social Democracy to searching analysis. What can explain this silence? Not agreement, as we shall show. Rather it is to be explained by the blows given to the C.I.'s theories by the events of the last eighteen months and the vindication of Comrade Trotsky's analysis and opinions.

#### "SOCIAL FASCISM"

Dutt defends the theory of "Social Fascism", a theory which sums up in itself the whole errors of the ultra-left policy of the Communist International. This theory began with the profound observation of Stalin that, "Social Democracy and Fascism are twins". After loyally quoting the master Dutt endeavours to amplify and support this. His argument is that at certain stages and under certain conditions the capitalist class rule through Social Democracy: under other conditions they rule through Fascism.

The objection to the term "Social Fascism" is not that it offends the Socialist workers: this is important but not decisive. The main objection must be to the falseness of the theory underlying it and to the whole system of tactical errors which will arise from its application to any given situation. Social Democracy and Fascism both represent methods by which capitalism maintains its rule; when this is said however, important differences arise which, in matters of tactics, are decisive.

Fascism derives its support from the middle classes and from the lumpen-proletariat. Social Democracy is based upon the workers. Parliament is the main arena of Social Democracy: Fascism destroys parliamentary democracy. Fascism cannot rule without the complete destruction of the Social Democracy and the workers' organisations upon which it rests. Dutt brushes this aside as unimportant. But Marxist policy in relation to Fascism must be based not only upon Social Democracy's responsibility for Fascism's victory but equally upon the irreconcilability of Fascism with the workers' organisation upon which the Social Democracy rests.

Dutt recognises, in a curiously distorted way some distinction when discussing forms of dictatorships that are not 'complete Fascism'. He speaks of 'Near Fascism' or of 'pre Fascist' regimes. Searching for the difference between Fascism in Germany and Italy, and the dictatorships in such countries as Bulgaria and Poland, Dutt finds it in the METHOD by which Fascism gets and retains power. He does not see, or will not see, that this destroys his whole case for "Social Fascism and demolishes at one blow the whole theory by which nearly every Government that uses repression can be called "Fascist". The difference is in the relationship of classes under the two regimes, in the fact that Fascism means shifting the mass basis of bourgeois rule from the working class and their organisations to the middle class and the wiping out of the working class organisations. This difference is vital and is in no way contradicted by the fact that between the system of class relationships called "parliamentary democracy" and that called "Fascist" there can, and often does, exist a regime which contains the features of both, during which time

the capitalists maintain power by leaning on Social-democracy and Fascism, playing the one against the other and ruling by the police and military forces of the state. The important point, to the workers and to the revolutionaries, is that the workers' mass organisations exist: on these depend not only Social Democracy but in the last analysis also the revolutionary movement.

The vital nature of this is obvious, especially for the tactic of the United Front. You cannot fight Fascism by uniting with Fascism or Social-Fascism; as the German Communists maintained for years as an argument against the united front of working class organisations. But the Comintern has since recognised differences of a decisive character by its offer of a united front to the Socialist Parties, a very great difference from 1931 when it united with the Nazis against the Social Democrats. Appeals for unity against the common enemy are apt to wear an unconvincing appearance when those appealed to are described as "Social Fascists" and their organisations said to have become "fascistised".

#### "ONLY FROM BELOW"

It was because of the supposed identity of Social Democracy with Fascism that the slogan of the German Communist Party was the united front "only from below". For this reason they called for the "main blow against the Social Democrats", not against the Fascists. Dutt avoids discussion of this by posing the question thus: "There remains the question whether Communism in Germany, as is sometimes urged by certain critics, over emphasised the policy of the "united front from below". Notice that we have all the appearance of meeting the charges of "certain critics" and replying with all reasonableness, that such criticism is based upon their not understanding the conditions. It is a piece of trickery hard to equal, even in the pages of Comintern journalism.

What has become of the "united front only from below"? Or the scorn, the denunciation, the threats which fill the pages of the Comintern press from 1929 to 1934 against those who suggest or attempt the united front with Social Democratic organisations? We have not space to deal fully with this; we refer our readers to the reports of the 11th, 12th, and 13th Comintern Plenums, and to the speeches and writings of Thaelmann, Manuilsky, and Molotov over this period.

To give one example of the atmosphere that existed: towards the end of 1931 Thaelmann wrote, "The Social Democrats are threatening to form a united front with the Communist Party" (threatening!). He called upon the Communist Party to "counteract this TREACHERY".

Throughout the section dealing with Germany and with Austria we are given to believe that the Communist Party saw and warned against the danger whilst the Socialists remained blind. Is this contrast of the clear-sighted communists and the blind Social Democrats a true one? In 1931 Thaelmann, on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Comintern spoke on the situation in Germany. After informing the workers that the Brüning Government was Fascist, and that THEREFORE HITLER NEED NOT COME TO POWER, he said: "We however concluded seriously and soberly that the 14th of September 1930 had been Hitler's best day, so to speak, and would not be followed by better ones but by worse... our pre-estimate of the

development of this party has already been confirmed by facts".

The question of the "Red Trade Unions" is also evaded. Dutt argues that they were formed because of expulsions of Communists from the Social Democratic Trade Unions.

It needs to be stressed that the Comintern, far from reluctantly organising the expelled workers into separate unions, actually exalted the expulsions into an emblem of glorious revolutionary advance and carried forward continual and constant propaganda for the building of the "Red" unions as against the Social Democratic unions.

On page 126 Dutt makes the important admission that the German Social Democrats had the support of nine tenths of the industrial workers. Why then were these facts hidden until it became necessary to find reasons for the debacle of German Communism? We were told, with wearying repetition, prior to Hitler's victory, of the great advances of the German Communist Party, of the great successes of the "united front from below" and of losses suffered by the Social Democrats through the treachery being exposed to the workers in times of political crises and change revolutionary parties should advance by leaps and bounds. ON DUTT'S OWN ADMISSION THE ULTRA LEFT POLICY OF THE COMINTERN RESULTED IN THE GERMAN COMMUNIST PARTY BEING WITHOUT REAL FOLLOWING AMONG THE ORGANISED WORKERS.

#### BANKRUPTCY

The bankruptcy of the C.P.G.B. is most glaringly revealed in the conclusions drawn from the lengthy analysis of Fascism. Dutt asks: "Is Fascism the end of all things" for the workers' movement? To a revolutionary the question is superfluous. But Dutt goes to astounding lengths. Falling back upon imaginative literature he quotes from Morris's "News From Nowhere" in which we are shown that a massacre of an armed workers, far from ending, began the civil war. "It destroyed the myths and illusions of legality and passive slavery and laid bare the civil war, which, once begun, could only finally end with the victory of the masses" exclaims Dutt. "AND THAT ABOVE ALL IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FASCISM". It is the weapon of history for "the purging and burning out of pacific illusions among the workers".

FASCISM IS TO DO WHAT THE COMMUNIST PARTY HAS FAILED TO DO. Here again we find the reliance upon automatic processes. But when we look around at the actual results of Fascism we find not the slightest justification for this. Fascism arises out of the economic and political crisis of capitalism. To this extent the very growth of Fascism is a reflection of the weakened power of the ruling class. This much is incontestable. But the victory of Fascism does not necessarily mean the passing over of the workers to revolutionary struggle, to the overthrow of capitalism. The victory of Fascism destroys the mass organisations upon which the successful building of the revolutionary party depends. Fascism takes away from the workers every foothold they have gained in capitalist society. The destruction of the workers' organisations, the temporary dispersal of the existing political parties of the workers is not advance but defeat.

(continued on page 1 col. 3.)

Printed by W. Cullis, 23 Gunter Grove, S. W.  
Published by H. Dewar, 36 West Side S. W.