

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL NEWS

VOL.3 . No.1.

JANUARY 1940

TWOPENCE

CHAMBERLAIN'S DILEMMA

It is obvious from a fleeting glance at the newspapers that the question of opening a new front in the war has occupied the close attention of the General Staff of Allied Imperialism, both, political and military. The question of intervention against the Soviet Union by the immediate despatch of an expeditionary force to aid the Finns has been discussed as a practical problem.

In the French press "Le Temps", mouth-piece of French monopoly capitalism, have appeared articles suggesting a blockade of Murmansk by the Allied Navies and the landing of an expeditionary force there to aid the Finns. Simultaneously the Black Sea was to be another field of operations and the conquest or, if necessary, destruction of the Baku Oilfields achieved. In this way they would cut off oil supp-

lies to Germany and strike a blow simultaneously against "Bolshevism," thus killing two birds with one stone. Unmentioned, of course, would be the necessity of drawing in the two "neutrals" - Rumania and Turkey - to provide bases, and the inevitable extension of the war over all the Balkan countries.

In the past few weeks a terrific campaign has been waged in the world press against the Soviet Union under Allied inspiration, and in Britain and France themselves the major shrieks of the press were not directed against Germany but the full blast was turned in the direction of the Soviet Union. It would have seemed that military operations against Russia were imminent.

But for the moment the support being given by Britain and France to Finland

is limited to the sending of material assistance. Chamberlain has stated that Britain would send as much aid as she could spare to help the Finns, but has not suggested as yet the entry of Allied troops on the scene. The effort is limited to the attempt to involve Sweden and Norway deeper and deeper by egging them on to conflict with the Soviet Union.

The difference between the policy of French and British imperialism is of course no accident. It is no love for the Soviet regime which has dictated the cautious attitude of Whitehall at the present stage of the diplomatic game, but fear of the complications which war with Russia might involve.

As far as Britain is concerned, it was of course, fear of the loss of her Empire which forced the bourgeoisie to declare war on Germany, but already she sits uneasily in possession of her colonial riches, especially India. Already a rumble and a stirring of the centuries oppressed masses is apparent under the surface and with a prolonged war, even with the present relation of forces it is not certain that British imperialism will retain her grip on India. The loss of this "brightest jewel" is the loss of the Empire and the end of her rule as a world power.

It is not fear of Russia as a military power but the political consequences of a war against the Soviet Union that stays the hand of Chamberlain - although the weakness of the Red Army has been exaggerated and an underestimation of its capacity deliberately made in the press - nevertheless the generals are aware that it is a strong force.

The Stalinist bureaucracy is actively opposed to the extension of the proletarian revolution in the West

which would precipitate their overthrow through its effects on the Russian masses. All the imperialists take cognisance of this fact. But the "Times" in an article, carefully analysed the effect of the seizure of the land by the peasants in the territory occupied by the Red Army in the Polish Ukraine. And the conclusion to which it came was that all the peasant masses in the Balkan countries would welcome an invasion by the Red Army by similar acts of expropriation. The lesson has not been lost on them.

The British imperialists know full well that in self preservation the Bonapartist bureaucracy can still resort to progressive measures in backward countries where feudalism still holds sway. Just as the armies of Napoleon could conquer all Europe by breaking the fetters of serfdom, so the bureaucracy can, under imminent threat of destruction, throw a match into the inflammable state of agrarian unrest among the land-hungry peasants of India. It would not be a question of military victory. The Red Army would only have to make contact on the borders of India with the discontented tribesmen and peasants. They would supply the arms and the slogan -SEIZE THE LAND- the peasants would do the rest. Myriads would rise throughout India and Britain would be faced with the task of invading and reconquering India.

Of course Stalin would only resort to such extreme measures if there were no other way out. But the possibility exists and the imperialists are compelled to take this into account. Then again, the conquest of Russia itself would be no easy task. Its size and the terrain make it an extremely hazardous enterprise. Also the British imperialists still hope that if they cannot win Germany against Russia, they

may yet be able to win Russia against Germany.

Turning to the French press we find the bourgeoisie in favour of launching war on Russia because of the internal situation. The outbreak of war found a deep social crisis in France with the French workers in ferment. The Bonapartist dictatorship which Daladier immediately clamped down on the masses could not achieve that relative stability which Hitler obtained because of his mass petty bourgeois base, through lack of popular support and the mobilisation of the masses for war purposes. Discontent with the harsh conditions imposed by the rigours of war is rife throughout France. The inactivity at the front further aggravates the situation. Under these conditions there is need for some diversion to distract the attention of the masses. An offensive must be launched on some front - an offensive which, in its first phases at least can show some successes. An unsuccessful attack on the Siegfried Line would be disastrous, so the French are looking for some other outlet where risks are fewer and chances of success greater. French imperialism, because of the geography of the French Empire, is comparatively immune from the danger of direct contact between the Red Army and the land-hungry masses in her colonies. But the French too realise the dangers in such an attempt at the present time and merely suggest it because of the impasse in which they find themselves. But it is London which is the dominant partner in the coalition and for the time being Paris must wait....

Britain has attempted ever since the rise of Hitler, to turn German imperialism in the direction of the East. After the control of the Baltic States had passed into the hands of Stalin,

and again after the invasion of Finland, the British press solemnly and disinterestedly advised Hitler that he was acting contrary to the real interests of Germany. The Baltic had become a Russian Lake - it behoved Germany to take action against the danger in the rear. But the German bourgeoisie somehow could not see that the British really had their interests at heart and even threatened Sweden and Norway for their support of the Finns. Hitler had in fact become chief "defender" of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics!

Hitler had been enabled to take this path because of the counter revolutionary role of Stalin. The stakes for him are greater than the immediate destruction of the gains of October. Time enough to turn his attention on Russia later. First he wishes to gain world dominance. From Stalin there is no immediate danger. That is how the Germans view the situation. In addition they are paying careful attention to the counter revolutionary possibilities in Russia itself. With Russia drawn more and more into the German orbit, the Germans can help the restorationist wing of the bureaucracy by peaceful means at the present time and with great advantages to German economy.

Thus the war in Finland gives a glimpse of the contradictions which are convulsing the globe. Which way events will turn in the spring when the first offensives are launched, and in what sphere, only events can show. But there is no doubt that the entire planet will be involved. The frightful havoc of Armageddon will not allow the conflict to go forward to its gory end, the destruction of all Europe and famine on the entire Earth. Long before it has reached this stage the masses will have said their last word.

In Defence of October

Three concurrent wars - in China, in the West and in Finland are now in progress and every day brings nearer their fusion into one great holocaust drawing into its flames the Low Countries, the Balkans, Scandinavia and the United States. The deadlock in the West, occasioned partly by adverse weather conditions and partly by the desperate manoeuvrings of the protagonists in the diplomatic field, must be resolved in the course of events, and seasons by a positive move from the one side or the other, and this in its turn must precipitate the tentative alliances of today into the two great warring camps of tomorrow. The thaw will in more senses than one launch the avalanches which threaten to sweep away modern civilisation in their catastrophic course.

Driven by economic causes beyond their control, shuddering at the terrifying prospects that open before them, the ruling classes of Britain, Germany and Japan are nevertheless not able, even if they were willing, to turn back. And the Stalinist rulers of Russia, caught up in the web of developing events are equally incapable of following any other path than that which they are following today. The whole course of their previous policies has rendered inevitable their present actions.

Their moves carry the stamp of desperation. Only out of desperation was it possible to conceive the project of a campaign commenced in the dead of winter, in unfamiliar terrain and against a not ill-equipped foe. But it

is not only in the military character of the invasion of Finland that it is possible to detect the influence of panic. The political obstacles to the launching of the war were far more important and far more formidable than the snow drifts, the armaments and the Mannerheim Line before them. Even the cynical Kremlin functionaries, contemptuous though they have shown themselves to world opinion in the purges and the Trials, even they must have realised the aftermath that would inevitably follow their move, in the shape of disapproval and loss of sympathy among the world proletariat and even in their active hostility. And yet they launched the attack, as a desperate gambler's throw to recoup the heavy losses made up to then, in one wild speculation that staked all that remained, win or lose.

The entire previous course of Stalinist policy, gambling all its resources on capitalist alliances prepared the way for this last venture. Because Stalin wished for an alliance with the Western bourgeoisie, he went to all lengths to prove that the Comintern was a weapon, which could be used to defend their profits if they would give him in turn the alliance he needed to defend the privileges of the Kremlin oligarchy. The Communist Parties of Great Britain and France proclaimed the war for the defence of democracy, abandoned the anti-militarist struggle, sang the national anthems carried the Tricolour and the Union Jack at the head of Workers' May Day processions, sold the Spanish revolution to Negrin and the gains from the

January 1940

W.I.N

5

struggles of the French workers to Daladier. They acclaimed the Churchills, Edens and Duff-Coopers, they fraternised with the Duchesses and the Deans, the Sinclairs and the Lloyd Georges. They staked the entire tradition of revolutionary struggle inherited from the October Revolution - and they lost. The pact with Britain failed to materialise. Having parted with the last rag of pretence of being a revolutionary world party, they found themselves turned away without ceremony and left to attempt to repair their shattered fortunes by military moves in Poland and Finland, moves by which they gain strategic advantages of doubtful value at the price of sacrificing the real defence of the Soviet Union, the sympathy and support of the toiling masses in the West. It was not the possession of strategic points that saved the Soviet Union in the intervention of twenty years ago, but the support of the international working class typified in the Jolly George incident. The possibility of future Jolly George support has been flung away for the sake of "material" advantages not one millionth part as effective.

In the past period Stalinism drove the nails one by one into the coffin awaiting it today. The notion of "aggressors" was hammered into the minds of the militant workers, as if it were possible to characterise one set of bandits as aggressors against another bandit gang. In this way they prepared the minds of the working masses to accept the label of "aggressors" now applied to themselves. In vain they point to the simple truth that the "act of aggression" against Finland is but the attempt of the future victim to disarm the bandits who threaten her. In vain they try to point out that bourgeois Finland is not "independent small nation" but a vass-

al of the imperialists. This is true, but they painted Czechoslovakia, also an imperialist vassal, as a "small nation" whose "independence" was threatened. They told this lie so well and so thoroughly that they cannot complain if it has turned out to be a boomerang. The League of Nations was characterised by Lenin as the "den of thieves", but they entered it, bolstered it up, proclaimed it a force for peace. A touch of irony is added when the inmates of the thieves' den virtuously show them the door and today Stalin's PRAVDA laments "The League of Nations has been turned from an instrument of peace into an instrument of war."

If the Western Powers do not seize the admirable opportunity this gives them to exploit the hostility against Russia engendered in the working class by the juxtaposition of popular front ideology and Stalinist action, it is because their hands are occupied with present business. They whip up that hostility to its highest pitch but they dare not as yet embark upon the venture of a war against Russia.

Such a war would be an attempt to destroy, not only the Stalin regime, but the collectivised property which still remains as the heritage of the October Revolution. The fundamental interests of the world proletariat demand the preservation of what remains of the October conquests as a basis and a starting point for further conquests. It is necessary to fight against the attempt to depict the Soviet Union and Stalinism as identical, to show to the working masses that the defence of the Soviet Union means the overthrow of Stalinism. But that overthrow can be achieved only by the Russian masses themselves. We must fight with all our force against the intervention of the Western bourgeoi-

sie, who plan ostensibly to overthrow Stalinism but in reality to destroy the social basis of Soviet property and to carve up the territory into colonies. East, the West and the Baltic to coalesce together into a great Armageddon which will give rise to rivers of blood. The struggle for the ending of the war and for the preservation of the remains of the gains of October are reduced in the final analysis to the struggle against the bourgeoisie at home.

The coming months will see an increasing tendency for the wars in the

The Real Situation In India

September 5th 1939, the day Britain declared war on Germany, witnessed also the passing of the Defence of India Act. Under this Act the Viceroy of India was given power to pass any ordinance which he considered necessary for the security of India and for the proper prosecution of the war. Thus, by a stroke of the pen, the few political rights which the Indian people had won after decades of struggle, were filched away.

It is easy to see that actions prejudicial to "the security of India" or to "the proper prosecution of the war" might mean any form of action or speech which is likely to inconvenience the Government.

The Rules and Orders in Council passed under the Emergency Powers Act in Britain are equally directed against the people. But here they are at present being kept in abeyance merely as a threat, whereas in India the ordinances under the Defence of India Act are in daily operation. Let us take two examples.

The Associated Press of India reports on October 5th 1939 "The police searched this afternoon the offices of the 'Comrade' the English weekly, the Bengal Provincial Peasant Committee, the Bengal Trade Union Congress and the Bengal Jute Mill Workers' Union, under the Defence of India Ordinance. In search of a red leaflet, the special branch of the Calcutta police raided today about half a dozen places including a printing press." On October 30th 1939, the same News Agency reported the arrest and imprisonment under the Defence of India Act, of three individuals from such widely separated places as Calcutta, Karachi and Multan for having made speeches condemning the war. The two instances mentioned above were selected out of hundreds of similar ones to illustrate the character of the repression in India today.

In the first place, the police drive is mainly directed against the socialist and radical anti-imperialist elements. This is sound imperialist policy based upon a correct understanding of the fact that in the not too dis-

tant future it will be the organised-workers in the industrial areas of India who will play the leading role in the struggle against British imperialism and its war. In the second place the repression is not confined to one particular locality but extends throughout the length and breadth of British India. In the Native States the great feudal landlords have equipped themselves with home-made Public Security Acts to deal similarly with their own subjects.

The impact of the war on the Indian masses has already been felt. As war contracts are pouring into the pockets of the mill-owners, the factory laws relating to limitations of hours of work in Indian factories are being abandoned one after the other.

On November 10th 1939, the Associated Press reports "All Jute Mills in the Province of Bihar have been exempted from the provision of the Factories Act, dealing with limitations of work, for the period during which the Public Emergency arising out of the war continues." On November 28th 1939 reports the same Agency, "The latest orders placed by the British Government with the Indian Jute Mills Association for 500,000,000 sand bags have necessitated a further increase of working hours to sixty per week.

Prices are increasing by leaps and bounds. A non-official resolution discussed on December 6th in the Bengal Legislature draws attention to the "abnormal rise in the prices of commodities of daily necessity and the possibility of a breach of peace any moment as a result of this."

The war means tremendous profits for the capitalists, both white and brown, but for the masses of the toilers of India, it can bring nothing but further

impoverishment in their miserable conditions of living. But the imperialists have no illusions about the real attitude of the Indian masses towards the war. The repressive measures now in full swing in India give the lie to all the propaganda about India's loyalty to the war.

Patriotic Britishers who desired to come home to volunteer for service were not permitted to leave India. We thus witness the paradoxical spectacle of Indian troops being sent to Singapore, Egypt and the Western Front, while the Britisher is forced to remain in India. The explanation, however, is to be found in a recent Government communique which says, "Such action (of young Britishers who desired to go home to volunteer for national service)-Ed. though inspired by the most patriotic of motives is not in the interests of India and persons desirous of leaving India are requested to apply instead for temporary commission in the Army in India or for regular British units serving in India." The sons of the British bourgeoisie in India can always be relied upon to be the staunchest supporters of imperialist rule. The Garwali Rifles, by their refusal to fire upon Indian workers in 1931, demonstrated that Indian troops are not immune to revolutionary atmosphere.

Consider again the agreement between the Government of India and the King of Nepal under which 8,000 Nepali troops will be employed by the former for service in various parts in India. In using these barbarian troops Britain is only following the example of the Russian Czar who preferred to rely upon his Cossaks to deal with the Petrograd workers. It is good imperialist policy but it destroys the illusion that Indian loyalty is unbounded.

The Imperial Government apprehends a mass upheaval in India as a result of the additional sufferings which war will impose upon the Indian masses. It is precisely because of this that imperialism cannot grant any concession to the Indian capitalists. The leaders of the National Congress, Gandhi and Nehru, do not seriously intend to oppose the war because as the political representatives of the Indian capitalists and landlords, they cannot dissociate their fate from that of their masters, the capitalists and financiers of London. These leaders are for the war. "Strange as it may appear, my sympathies are wholly with the Allies. Willy nilly this war is resolving itself into one between such democracy as the West has evolved and totalitarianism as is typified by Herr Hitler... Unless the Allies suffer demoralisation, of which there is not the slightest indication, this war may be used to end all wars." Thus wrote Mr. Gandhi on September 30th (HINDU, Sept. 31st 1939). The Congress leaders would like to come out in open support of the war and as recruiting agents for Chamberlain. The only thing that holds them back is the tremendous hostility among the masses of India and among the rank and file members of the Congress towards war. The latest resolution of the Congress demonstrates this. On the one hand the Congress "dissociates itself from British policy and war efforts" while on the other hand it expresses its determination to "continue to explore the means of arriving at an honourable settlement, even though the British Government has banged the door in the face of the Congress." This resolution, says Dr. Bose, an ex-president of the Congress and one of the leaders of the left-wing, means that "we shall continue to lick the feet of the British Government even though we have been kicked by them," Mr. Bose who is a Gandhist

who has accidentally quarrelled with gandhism and who is opposed to the revolutionary instincts of the Indian masses just as much as Mr. Gandhi is, but even he has to express his disgust with the belly-crawling and treacherous policy of the Gandhis and Nehrus whom the Stalinists and the I.L.P. opportunists in this country have depicted before the British workers as leaders of the Indian revolution. "For the Rightists" says Mr. Bose, "British Imperialism is a lesser enemy than Indian Leftism."

Referring to the possibility of the Congress initiating another Civil Disobedience Movement, Mr. Gandhi declared on November 20th, "I have neither the strength nor the desire for such activities." This obvious lack of appetite for even a moderate struggle is probably due to the "disquieting information which is believed to have reached Mr. Gandhi about the absence of an atmosphere of perfect non-violence in certain places in the United Provinces. There is a section which is growing restive and discontented and sees that the resignation of the Congress Ministries is after all a negative step and must be followed by positive action." (HINDU, Nov, 20th 1939.)

That is the reason why this hypocritical agent of the British ruling class warned the Congress workers that he "would not allow the rank and file to set the pace for the movement as a whole and if they were anxious to retain his leadership, it must be on his terms and not theirs." (HINDU Nov. 20.)

Neither the ordinances of British imperialism nor the treachery of the capitalist politicians of India will be able to prevent the inevitable uprising of the Indian masses against imperialist oppression accentuated by

the war. It is impossible to conceive that the workers in advanced Europe will continue indefinitely to be blinded by the lying speeches of Labour and Trade Union officials. In India - similarly the disillusionment of the masses with the treacherous leaders will grow at a rapid pace.

The Indian Stalinists, obediently carrying out the behests of the reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy do their best to deliver over the Indian masses to the Indian reactionaries. They sabotaged every attempt on the part of the masses to play an independent role in the struggle against imperialism. Just as in this country they held up the Churchills and the Duchesses before the working class as the staunchest of fighters against fascism, so also in India they painted the reactionary Gandhi-Nehru line-up as the leaders of the anti-imperialist struggle. Even now that the Popular Front has been abandoned as a direct consequence of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the Indian Stalinists are still forced

to pursue the old line. Dimitrov, in the course of laying down the new line for the party hacks, points out that although popular fronts are no longer suitable for white workers, "they are fully applicable even now in China and also in colonial and dependent countries." (Daily Worker, Nov 4th 1939.) The history of the Comintern in India is one of repeated betrayals. The Indian workers can have nothing but contempt for such scoundrels.

The Indian revolution can succeed only under the leadership of the Indian working class, the most consistently anti-imperialist section of the Indian people. Small though it is, it alone is capable of rallying the hundreds of millions of the impoverished peasantry under the banner of the revolution. To the building of a party, our Indian comrades must direct all their efforts. The revolutionary socialist Party of the Indian proletariat must necessarily be the Indian section of the Fourth International, the vanguard of the international working class.

I.L.P. and C.P. at War

An important effect of Stalin's seizure of Eastern Poland, so far as the proletariat of this country is concerned, is the changed relationship of two of the forces striving to become the leadership of the organised workers - the so-called Communist Party and the Independent Labour Party.

Since the I.L.P. severed its organisational connection with the Second International in 1932, having had no basis for an "independent" existence,

it has consistently striven to share the leadership of the popular masses with the British Section of the Third International, always contenting itself with "defence" against the vilifications and slanders of the Stalinists and never taking up the offensive position.

During the early period of disaffiliation from the Labour Party, the I.L.P. even went so far as to apply for affiliation to the Comintern and, despite the unsuccessful outcome, abor-

tive "unity" campaigns and "negotiations" with the C.P. have been on the regular order of the day right up to the time of the suppression of the brother party of the I.L.P. in Spain, the P.O.U.M., by the G.P.U.

Even this episode, however, did not fundamentally alter the attitude of the I.L.P. towards the paid hirelings of the Kremlin, nor shake the belief of Messrs. Brockway, Maxton and Co. in the revolutionary potentialities of the Stalinist. The elevation of the anti-Stalinist, anti-Trotskyist philosopher, Dr. C.A. Smith, into the sacred portals of the St. Bride Street hierarchy, together with the military operations of the Red Army, has now brought about the inevitable cleavage. The political arena which was hitherto served as a gymnasium for the King Street rascals and the I.L.P. sycophants is now transformed into a battlefield.

The formal declaration of the changed relationship and the challenge to mortal combat was contained in the "New Leader" statement of September 22nd, "Russia's present move (the march into Poland) marks the final stage in the departure by the Stalin regime from the principles of International Socialism and its adoption of purely imperialistic power politics. This development shows that the whole international Socialist and Communist movement must be rebuilt."

The first practical encounter followed a few weeks later when the two organisations met face to face in the Stretford by election. The I.L.P. refused to come to "an understanding" with the C.P. when invited to do so by Mr. Frank Bright. And they were correct, since the Stalinist idea of "an understanding" was a request that Bob Edwards should be withdrawn in

favour of Eric Gower, whose intervention in the contest was announced six days after the I.L.P. had declared in the press their intention of sponsoring a candidate.

The result of the Stretford by election cannot by any means be regarded as a true indication of the degree of mass support which each party has generally. Nevertheless, the decisive defeat of Gower and the comparative success of Edwards marks round one in favour of the I.L.P. on the indicator.

This has caused considerable consternation and alarm in the ranks of the "Communist" Party leadership - alarm which is reflected in the subtle attacks which are beginning to appear in the "Daily Worker". On December 18th, Walter Holmes seized on a statement of R.H. Crossman which was contained in an article in "Reynolds News", on the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda. The statement which read: "Listening to Lord Haw-Haw you might sometimes imagine that he was a member of the I.L.P., so ardent is his pacifism and belief in the cause of working class emancipation" - was characteristically misquoted by the journalistic prostitute of King Street who cut it off in the middle of the sentence to read: "Listening to Lord Haw-Haw you might sometimes imagine that he was a member of the I.L.P."

The Stalinist hacks are, however aware that mere slanders of this nature will avail them nothing in the eyes of the thinking and honest workers and so they find themselves driven into the unenviable position of having to attack the I.L.P. on a political basis. Unenviable, not because the I.L.P. policy does not leave itself open to attack from Marxists, but because there can be no possible defence for the acrobatic contortions executed

at the behest of Moscow by Messrs. Dutt, Gallacher and Co.

Undeterred, however, by such details the "Daily Worker" glibly reproduces the writings of Lenin in order to attack their new enemy. On December 15th, they reproduce a passage on Centrism from Lenin's "Tasks of the Proletariat" with the comment, "in view of tendencies that are becoming prominent today in the working class movement, the Daily Worker prints below the opinion of Lenin on the "Centrists." They do not make any reference to the I.L.P. and its international associations but their object is clearly to politically discredit their new rivals in the eyes of the wavering and disillusioned supporters of Stalinism who are seeking for a socialist party which they can support.

The "Daily Worker" is correct when it states that centrist tendencies are becoming prominent in the working class movement. During the period of reaction through which the British working class movement has been passing the I.L.P. declined to the lowest possible ebb, whilst the Stalinists, with their opportunist liberal policy, up to the time of the first weeks of the new imperialist war, attracted large numbers of the petty bourgeoisie. Today the position is changing rapidly. The recent moves of the Kremlin government have lost the U.S.S.R. and the Communist International the support of the "anti-fascist" liberals. The volte face on the war issue has lost the Communist Party the support of the "anti-Hitler" labourites. In addition, their political gyrations executed in accordance with the whims of the Moscow paymasters has discredited this party in the eyes of all honest and thinking workers.

The I.L.P. has, on the other hand because of its consistent opposition to war, leaped into prominence, recruiting support from the petty-bourgeois pacifists and from the anti-war element in the labour movement.

Due to the fact that no genuinely revolutionary party with a mass basis exists today, we are faced with the tragic situation wherein the British agents of the Moscow bureaucracy who masquerade as a Communist Party, and the I.L.P. appear before the masses as the only alternative leadership to the Transport House traitors who, at the behest of their capitalist masters and true to the traditions of Social-Democracy, are leading the toilers to slaughter and destruction in the interests of imperialist profits.

While the Stalinists and the Centrists have differences in the tactical operations of their policy, and the degree of opportunism pursued, they have in common the policy of servility to imperialism. Unable to give a revolutionary lead - the I.L.P. because of its pacifist composition and the Stalinists because of the counter-revolutionary rôle of the Kremlin bureaucracy - they shout in unison for an immediate peace. Implicit in this peace demand is an appeal to the Governments of the gangster imperialists to get round the table and divide the spoils of colonial conquests at the expense of the oppressed toilers. This is rendered impossible by the contradictions of decaying capitalism as is testified by the fact that arms have been resorted to as the final arbitrament.

There can only be one way out of the impasse for the workers - the road of proletarian revolution, a road which must be travelled by the masses independently and alone, against the

forces of the bourgeoisie and their agents in the working class movement.

The fundamental prerequisite for such a course to be pursued successfully is the building of a steeled revolutionary vanguard! Neither the lackeys of Stalin nor the I.L.P. and the other political members which have

been raked together into the "International Workers Front Against War", can occupy this position. The vanguard must be built around the cadres of the Fourth International. The task of building the revolutionary party is the foremost item on the political agenda of the working class movement today.

Lenin - Liebknecht - Luxemburg

January 1940 marks the anniversary of the deaths of Lenin, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. On the 15th January, 1919, after the failure of the Spartacist Insurrection of the Berlin workers, Liebknecht and Luxemburg were murdered at the instigation of German Social Democracy.

In the last imperialist war, they had adopted a revolutionary position and had opposed to the treachery of the Social Democratic leaders who supported their own capitalist governments, the immortal slogan proclaimed by Liebknecht - THE MAIN ENEMY IS AT HOME - Liebknecht himself distributed revolutionary socialist propaganda leaflets among the German workers in the streets of Berlin.

The courageous stand made by these revolutionists has been justified by events. Lenin in Switzerland had issued the call to the workers of all lands to take action against their oppressors in order to end the imperialist war by turning it into a war against their own capitalist class.

The Second International has betrayed the workers, he said, by their support of their own imperialist governments. The Second International is

dead as an instrument of social progress and can only act as a tool now of the capitalists. Down with the Second International! We must now work for the building of a new International which will genuinely represent the interests of the toilers. This call was issued when social democracy numbered millions, while those who had remained true to the ideals of international socialism counted only hundreds. But Lenin had an unshakable faith in the international working class. The war with its devastation and horror, famine and slaughter would teach the masses that on the road of capitalism there could be no way out for mankind. Only the victory of socialism through the seizure of power by the workers could stop the ghastly holocaust and end war and poverty.

The Social Democrats laughed at the utopian visionary in Switzerland with his hare-brained schemes of world revolution. But the Russian Revolution of 1917 demonstrated the superiority of Marxism as a basis for estimating social forces and showed clearly who were the realists and who the utopians. Guided by Lenin, the Bolshevik Party led the masses to October.

In Germany, Liebknecht and Luxemburg were striving towards the same

solution which the Russian proletariat had followed and achieved under the leadership of Lenin and Tretsky. The German workers, following the example set before them by their Russian brothers, surged irresistibly towards the revolution, despite all the attempts of the social democrats to hold them in check.

Under the blows of the aroused toilers, Hohenzollern Europe collapsed, almost without a struggle. An almost bloodless victory had been achieved. The Social Democrats who had the overwhelming majority of the toilers behind them sabotaged the achievement and handed back to the bourgeoisie, the power which rested in the hands of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets. They succeeded where the Russian Mensheviks failed.

The Spartacus League, organised by Liebknecht and Luxemburg was too weak to prevent this development of the counter-revolution. The workers finding themselves tricked gave vent to an outburst of indignation which culminated in the January Insurrection of 1919 as a direct result of the provocation of the Social Democratic Government. The junkers and reactionary officers who had formed and organised by the Social Democratic Government after the defeat of the insurrection, headed the Spartacus League, forerunner of the German Communist Party, by the assassination of its two great leaders. The Social Democrats have attempted to evade responsibility, but the blood of the martyred revolutionaries indelibly stains their hands.

Liebknecht and Luxemburg were dead, leaving Noske and Scheidemann, leaders of the Social Democrats to develop their "democracy" painlessly and gradually into socialism. We have seen the fruits of their policy. Fascism

and war, inevitable developments of the continuation of capitalism were the harvests which they had helped to sow in 1918. Scheidemann died in exile from Hitler Germany. Bitter must have been his reflections, if Social Democrats could learn anything from events when he died.

Lenin lived till 1924 in the best days of the Communist International. The defeats which the world proletariat suffered had as their consequence, the degeneration of the Soviet State and Communist International which he had founded. After his death the Third International followed in the wake of the Second. The Communist International together with the Social Democrats share joint responsibility for the rise of Hitler in Germany. The Communist Party of Germany, refused under any condition to have a united front with the Social Democrats in order to prevent Hitler coming to power, using as one argument, the betrayal of the German revolution of 1918, and the murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg.

From the date of Hitler's accession to power, the Third International was doomed as an organ of working class emancipation. With might and main they agitated in ardent competition with the social democratic chauvinists this holy war against Hitler. In pursuance of this aim, they did not stoop to spit in the graves of the great German revolutionaries. In commemorating the anniversary of their death - last year, they shifted the responsibility from the shoulders of the social democracy to the "reactionary bands, forerunners of Hitler." Luxemburg and Liebknecht were depicted as zealous fighters for that "democracy" which had exterminated them. And yet only a few years ago these same people were quoting the Social Democracy as

having published in one of its journals the day before the murders, the jingle:-

"500 corpses all in a row -
Why not Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Radek
and Co?"

With the new change of line this year they remember once again the role of Social Democracy and pay lip service to the ideas of the murdered revolutionaries.

Today, following the example of our

great teachers we can echo assuredly the words of Lenin, that ours is an epoch of "wars and revolutions." The capitalist system is doomed. While all seems dark and gloomy at the moment, we can say with confidence, even more than in the last war, the masses will awaken and overthrow their oppressors. This war began amid the curses and anguish of the masses, not with bands and music. It will end like the last with the masses taking their destiny in their own hands, giving new life to Liebknecht's slogan
YOUR MAIN ENEMY IS AT HOME.