

NOTES OF THE MONTH

*International United Front and Britain—Labour Party's Rôle
—British Bourgeois Orders—Wrecking Tactics—Brussels Joint
Meeting—British-Dutch-Scandinavian Opposition—L.S.I.
at Paris—Words and Deeds—February, 1933, Declaration
and To-day—A Menacing Division—The Island
Pharisees—British Illusions—Electoral Dreams
—Realities—Fascism in Britain—Communism
and the United Front—Communist
Electoral Tactics—The New Stage—
Trades Council Issue—The
Turning of the Tide*

BOTH in Britain and internationally we are now entering into the most critical stage of the fight for the united front. It is essential for every worker and for every Socialist to understand what is at stake in this fight. At the Brussels meeting of the representatives of the two Internationals Cachin said :

The danger is here ; our homes are on fire ; the working class is everywhere most tragically threatened. You are Socialists ; we are Communists ; but at this moment the danger is such that we must reach an understanding.

And again :

The question of the present hour is that we find ourselves on the very edge of the general fascisation of Europe, on the very edge of war ; that is the real question to-day.

That is the issue which overshadows every petty question, sectional interest, grievance, electoral calculation and the like in every country to-day ; by this issue the future will judge us. Every worker knows that the first essential to meet this menace is working class unity in the fight. Germany, Austria, Spain call aloud to us. The united workers of France, of Austria, of Spain, of Italy call aloud to us. What is holding up unity still two years after the terrible lesson of Germany ? The workers will demand a reckoning of every leader who stands in the way. It is in this situation that the Communist International has launched its direct appeal to the Second International

for the united front. The November meeting of the Executive of the Second International in Paris has revealed a sharp division among the leadership and the parties of the Second International. A profound transformation is developing among the social democratic workers, consequent on the eye-opening experience of Fascism. The overwhelming demand of the workers for unity has drawn a whole series of the social democratic parties into the united front. But the right wing section of the leadership in the Second International still maintains an obstinate resistance. As the leader and organiser of this resistance is revealed the British Labour Party. By this opposition a terrible responsibility is thrown on the British working class. *By this opposition the British Labour Party leadership is opening the gates to Fascism and War throughout the world.* We must awaken the whole British working class movement to this situation.

SEVEN years ago Lansbury, to-day leader of the Labour Party, declared :

I want to work both with J. R. Clynes and with Harry Pollitt ; I believe both are straight loyal good comrades ; they are in thorough disagreement as to methods and as to fundamentals. . . . Yet what is there to divide these two fighters or me from either ? (George Lansbury in *Lansbury's Labour Weekly*, May 7, 1927.)

That was seven years ago. To-day Lansbury, as leader of the Labour Party, is menacing with expulsion every worker who dares to enter on a common committee or speak on a common platform with Communists, even for such an object as the relief of victims of Fascism. *What has changed in these seven years?* Has Pollitt become any the less a "straight loyal good comrade," or wavered one inch or one iota in the working class fight ? Has the situation changed, or the need of the united front become any less urgent ? On the contrary, it is obvious to all that it has become a hundred times more urgent to-day, in the face of the menace of Fascism, that all sections should stand together against the common danger. Why, then, in the moment of the danger of Fascism, to intensify the war against Communism, to refuse the outstretched hands of the Communists and thus divide the working class ? Why in this hour

of greatest need of unity to turn the guns of the Executive, not against Fascism, but against every local united front conference and local united committee which the will of the workers to unity, correctly responsive to the urgent needs of the situation, is setting up? How is it possible that Lansbury and his colleagues, who learnt their socialism and entered into the movement at the feet of a Tom Mann, can to-day couple Tom Mann with Blackshirt thugs as equal enemies of the working class? Is there not something indescribably shameful in this? Is it not obvious to every serious Labour Party member and trade unionist that there is something profoundly wrong in this whole line? Is it worth while at this price to win the applause of the capitalists—and to destroy the working class movement?

WHEN the representatives of the Communist International and of the Second International met at Brussels on October 15, the *Times*, the organ of the British ruling class, was quick to scent the danger of a common working class front which would defeat all the plans of capitalism. Immediately it issued its orders to the British Labour Party to break the front. Its editorial of October 19 complained that, on the well-known principles of “democracy versus dictatorship,” such a meeting should have been impossible, that “Continental Socialists” were becoming little better than Communists, and that British Labour (“our Socialists”) should make an “unqualified stand” against them:

The Socialists have not replied by pointing out the absurdity of allying themselves with dictators of one school of thought in order to overthrow suspected dictators of another school. . . . The Socialists raise no objection whatever in principle to an alliance between declared believers in democracy and adherents of dictatorship

One certain thing is that those who join with Communists extend the Communist front. The term “united front” is only a disguise, transparently thin, as our (?) Socialists in this country, and more particularly our (?) trade union Socialists have repeatedly declared. Marxian theory has, however, spread so far that it is coming to appear that if you scratch a Continental Socialist who thought he was a democrat you will discover a Communist who is scarcely surprised to find himself in the company of dictators. *The British Labour*

Party is the strongest section of the Socialist International, and consistency with its declarations at home will require an unqualified stand for alliances only with friends of democracy. (Times, October 19, 1934.)

Thus the orders of the British bourgeoisie to "our Socialists."

AND now observe with what rapidity and fidelity the orders of the bourgeoisie have been carried out by the British Labour leadership. On October 24 the Labour Party Executive met. Next day the *Daily Herald* reported :

In harmony with its previous decision which was endorsed by the annual conference of the Party at Southport, the National Executive of the Labour Party declined to enter into any "united front" discussion with the Communist Party.

This decision will be the mandate of the Labour Party's representatives on the Executive Committee of the Labour and Socialist International at its meeting next month when the "united front" proposal of the Communist International is considered.

The official organ *Labour* underlined this in its November issue :

When the Executive of the Labour and Socialist International give consideration at their meeting next month to the proposals of the Communist International for a united front against Fascism, they will have to take into account the decisive attitude of the British Labour Party. . . . There can be very little likelihood that the Executive of the L.S.I. will find itself as a body in divergence from the point of view so emphatically expressed by the British section.

THIS was an open declaration of war on the line expressed at the Brussels joint conference in October by the Chairman of the Second International, Vandervelde, and the Secretary, Adler. Vandervelde stated :

If we could take for granted the acceptance of our sections, then I would say to you : We are with you ; I personally, and also Adler, would wish for nothing better. But we know very well that if we were to do this, we would come up against lively opposition in Holland, England, the Scandinavian countries, etc.

And again :

We must say to you to-day that we very much wish to organise this co-operation as quickly as possible, but that we would be disavowed by those we are representing and who would make very lively opposition to us.

Who are "those we are representing" who would "make opposition" to the united front and thus prevent the declared "personal wish" of Vandervelde and Adler to accept the proposal of the Communist International? Is it the workers? On the contrary. In the countries where the united front is not yet realised the most ruthless and continually intensified discipline has to be employed to prevent the workers realising the united front. There is no question that in every country without exception a referendum of the workers would show an overwhelming majority for the united front. The opposition comes only from a tiny handful of the inner ruling groups in the movements of the countries concerned, who, for the sake of unity with their bourgeoisie, are ready to destroy and prevent by every means the world united front of the working class.

UNDER the leadership of the British Labour Party a bloc of opposition to the united front was actively mobilised within the Second International. It may be noted that the countries drawn into this bloc closely corresponded in the main with the bloc of countries in Europe falling within the orbit of influence of British Imperialism; the main rôles were played by Holland and the Scandinavian countries. On the day after the decision of the Labour Party Executive, the Executive of the Swedish Social Democratic Party met and declared "the most determined opposition" to any form of co-operation and joint action. Albarda, the leader of Dutch Social Democracy, threatened the possibility of a split rather than accept any decision of the Second International for the united front. Similarly the *Pravo Lidu*, the organ of Czech Social Democracy, wrote:

We regard such an agreement as impossible in the present circumstances, when parties of the Second International are participating in the government or even have the government power in their hands.

It is not true to say that the International has any right to order what our attitude to the Communists shall be. That is entirely our affair. . . . We prefer to co-operate with the Republic and with those who defend it rather than with Krosnar, whose parliamentary immunity was suspended in order that the authorities might prosecute him for serious offences against the State.

The direct connection between opposition to the united front and coalition with the bourgeoisie is here openly expressed. And for the sake of this policy the bloc of opposition to the united front is prepared, not only to split the working class in their own countries, not only to prevent the united front of the two Internationals, but even to repudiate and split the Second International itself and to deny any International whatever rather than forego the policy of coalition with their own bourgeoisie.

THE November meeting of the Executive of the Second International in Paris brought these issues to a head. But it reached no solution, and in the nature of things could reach no solution ; for these issues run deep to the roots of Social Democracy, to the basic question of forming a front with the working class or with the bourgeoisie. The protracted discussions were conducted in closed session, and at the time of writing no report is yet available. It would appear, however, that, while the practical victory was won by the right wing, a virtual deadlock was reached between the opposing tendencies. The British Labour Party and its supporters were successful in stopping further negotiations ; the search for a formula to cover up the break under one or another detail plea does not seem to have been successful ; the negotiations have apparently been abruptly broken on the grounds of disagreement between the parties of the Second International. On the other hand, the British Labour Party and its supporters were not successful in their extreme demand to break the united front in the countries where it already existed (that is, to hand over the French workers to Fascism at the very moment of the renewed Fascist offensive, when only the united front is holding back Fascism). A resolution was passed leaving the sections in the different countries free to support the united front or to oppose it without any declaration of policy on this vital issue from their International. The *legitimisation* of the united front within the different sections of the Second International was thus for the first time admitted, in place of the previous formal ban which had had to be violated by France and other countries ;

this is a measure of the increasing strength of the united front. At the same time a further resolution is stated to have been adopted by a series of countries, including France, Spain, Italy, Austria, Poland and Switzerland, expressing a hope that the international negotiations may be renewed as soon as possible. It is obvious that these decisions settle nothing ; the fight for the united front goes forward.

WHAT does this process within the Second International reveal? It is noticeable that the parties supporting the international united front are mainly those where pressure from below has already resulted in the realisation of the united front in the countries concerned, and where the realisation of the international united front is consequently recognised as the logical and necessary next step. By this fact the correctness of the line of the Communist International in March, 1933, to carry forward the fight for the united front in the particular countries as the necessary pre-condition for the international united front is demonstrated. It will be remembered that in its Manifesto of February 19, 1933, the Second International had declared :

The Labour and Socialist International has always been ready to negotiate with the Communist International with a view to common action as soon as this body is also ready.

How does this declaration square with the present refusal to carry on negotiations for the united front? It will be further remembered that the Communist International in its Manifesto of March, 1933, threw doubt on the "sincerity" of this declaration of the Second International, and urged that the first step should be the formation of the united front in the particular countries. This reply was criticised at the time in some quarters on the grounds that the international negotiations should have begun at once. The event has shown that any such attempt would have only resulted in immediate breakdown and refusal from the side of the Second International, since even now, with a whole series of parties supporting the united front, the outcome is still a blank wall of refusal. But the difference to-day is that, on the basis of eighteen months' hard work for the

united front in all countries and the completion of a series of united front agreements in a number of countries, there now exists at last a strong minority of parties supporting the united front in the Second International, and the fight for the international united front can thus go forward with some hope of ultimate success.

IT is now important to bring out sharply the glaring contradiction between the declaration of the Second International on February, 1933, that it is "always ready to negotiate with the Communist International with a view to common action as soon as this body is also ready," and the present refusal as soon as that declaration is put to the test. What does this repudiation of its own words mean? How can the British Labour Party, which accepted and was a party to the February declaration without a word of protest or criticism, now loudly proclaim its opposition in principle to any united front with Communism? Such a stand throws a very dubious light on the sincerity of the February declaration. Of two things, one. Either the Second International has completely reversed its policy since the February declaration, and now opposes the united front at the very moment when the masses of the workers are moving towards it. Or the February declaration was never intended to be taken seriously, but was only, as many social democratic leaders have openly admitted that they regard all united front proposals, a "manœuvre"—which has since led to as much confusion and embarrassment in their camp, when the Communists proceeded to take it seriously, as was created in the Disarmament Conference by the Soviet Union when it proposed disarmament. In either case the practical conclusion is the same. The fight for the united front must be carried forward in the particular countries, in the countries where there is still opposition, the number of parties in the Second International supporting the united front must be increased, the resistance of the reactionary elements must be isolated in order that we may advance to the international united front.

WHAT is the most serious feature in the new division revealed between the two groupings in the Second International is the line along which this division runs. *The countries supporting the united front are the countries where Fascism has either conquered or where its menace is close. Where the Fascist danger is not yet seen so close, where extreme legalist conditions and illusions still prevail, there the need of the united front is still ignored and denied.* This is a most menacing line of division, implying not only a complete denial of international proletarian solidarity, but a most blind senseless suicidal trust of each movement in its own bourgeoisie, holding apart from any common struggle and hoping thus to pass through the storm unscathed, until the turn of the next sheep for slaughter comes. In Italy and Austria the united front is reached only after Fascism has already conquered ; similarly in Germany, where the united front is rapidly advancing, at present on a regional basis owing to the still incurable opposition of the Bourbons at Prague. In Spain the united front is reached barely three weeks before the final battle ; the result is the most powerful fight yet shown against Fascism, but not yet strong enough for victory ; the united front had not yet reached deep enough on a mass basis and could still be betrayed by the anarchist chiefs ; the strongest fight is achieved in Asturias, where the united front had been built up longest beforehand ; had the other provinces reached the level of Asturias, the result would have been victory. In France the direct attempted Fascist coup of February 6, which overthrew the Daladier Government and its parliamentary majority, woke up the entire working class movement to the necessity of the united front ; the resultant united front has made France the world centre of resistance to Fascism, has checked the advance of the Fascist offensive, has led to the fiasco of the Doumergue Government of National Concentration, its attempted anti-democratic transformation of the constitution and unconcealed appeal to the Fascist bands to come out on the streets, and now stands four-square to meet the threatening renewed Fascist offensive. And this common front of the French masses against Fascism, the strongest hope in the world at the present moment for

staying the advance of Fascism, the British Labour leadership with incredible lightheartedness and disregard of any consideration save their own immediate electoral parliamentary calculations have attempted at Paris to undermine and destroy.

IN every case the need for the united front is recognised only after the enemy's blow has been struck, or when the issues are already close and menacing. That this should happen once may be understandable. That it should happen twice is already serious. But three times, four times, five times, and that still the dwindling number of Labour movements on the old legal-democratic basis should remain blissfully hugging their supposed immunity, learning not a single lesson, taking not a single measure of elementary precaution or defence—this takes leave of all sense or reason. The supposed "democracies" of Europe have gone down one after another like nine-pins. The realities of class struggle in country after country have been laid bare in blood. And still the leaders of the Labour movements in a Holland, a Sweden or an England complacently strut about, congratulating themselves that they are not as others are, that they are privileged and secure in the sunshine of bourgeois favour, drawing up the hems of their garments from contamination with the mud and the blood of the desperate struggle of the workers in the other countries, scheming and manœuvring with a thousand cunning devices how to defeat the united front, the workers' only defence. This is not a picture of bedlam. It is only a picture of the last surviving reformist working class movements before the deluge.

NOWHERE is this illusory outlook to the future more dangerous than in Britain, where the heaviest battles are destined to develop. The workers in the elections, as the municipal elections have shown, are streaming to the Labour Party. This is no contradiction to the rising spirit of struggle which has shown itself at Olympia or Hyde Park, in the rising movement for wage increases, or in the developing united front advance overriding all bans in a number of important centres, as at Manchester or Bradford. It is a part of the same

movement. The workers are seeking to express their hatred of capitalism, their hatred of the National Government and its assistance to Fascism, their desire for a single class front, as they mass the Labour vote—in a series of London boroughs sweeping aside every other candidate and establishing one-party councils, presage (despite the contradictory form) of the future dictatorship of the proletariat, and already giving alarm to the Labour Party chiefs who propose to restore the balance and bring back the Tories by the aldermanic back-door. The Communist Party, recognising this situation and the sentiment of the workers, correctly set itself before the municipal elections to do all in its power to help forward the united working class front at the elections. Despite the Labour Party policy, programme and leadership, the elections can be utilised, and require to be utilised, as a means of mobilisation for the united class front of the workers. But woe to the workers if they put their hopes in a Labour Government, and fail to realise that their only defence and strength lies in their united class front, not merely in the paper battle of an election, but in the real struggles which await them.

THE Labour Party leaders, borne up on the tide of rising votes, ignoring all the deeper issues in front, see the future through roseate spectacles. They see themselves raised to the seats of government after a triumphant election. They see the economic crisis, as they believe, subsiding, and hope, as they hoped in 1929, to swim upon the crest of an upward movement. The war crisis may yet be postponed for a little while, meanwhile they will do their duty by armaments, and, if need be, they have already safeguarded their right, by the Southport decision, to repeat 1914. As for Fascism, they believe that Mosley, beaten back by the workers' resistance, is now in retreat. Thus all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds—provided only that they can discipline and check the left workers from making trouble, keep the Labour Party from getting mixed up with Communism, and thus maintain their respectability and fitness to govern in the eyes of the bourgeoisie.

THE realities of the future will reveal a very different picture. The dreams of the capitalist conquest of the economic crisis along the old lines of normal capitalism are idle dreams. Despite the loud talk of revival, despite the present rising profits of the capitalists, there is no question of recovery for British capitalism from the chronic sickness into which it has fallen, but only of bumps and jerks along the bottom, leading to ever more desperate measures. The present boom in gilt-edged stocks, and accumulation of masses of capital vainly seeking investment, illustrate how little confidence there is in industrial revival. The ship of capitalism is driving to war as its solution. Just as the Labour Government of 1929, starting with empty and frivolous hopes, rode to catastrophe, so the next Labour Government, if it is returned, will ride to greater catastrophe. The conflicts of the class struggle will increase. As disillusionment with the Labour Government grows, the peril of Fascism grows. There are already certain ominous signs, even at the present stage of the rising electoral tide of the Labour Party ; during the past year the individual membership, which had previously been steadily rising, fell by 5,000 ; there is complaint of increasing difficulties of raising finance in the local parties ; these indications suggest that the former middle class supporters are beginning to lose faith in the Labour Party ; as this process develops, they will turn increasingly, either to unity with the revolutionary workers, or to Fascism. The soil of Fascism is disillusionment with reformism, which paralyses the stable organised workers, while driving the unstable elements to Fascism.

THE notion that Fascism is in retreat in Britain, because Mosley's fortunes show for the moment a fluctuation and weakening before the determined resistance of the workers (a united front resistance achieved in spite of the Labour Party leadership) is a dangerous self-deception. The forces that drive to Fascism in Britain lie deeper than Mosley and the Blackshirts, lie in the whole present line of social, economic, constitutional and administrative development. Why does the whole present engine of the government, the police

and the law protect the Blackshirts in the face of universal public indignation, when the constitution of a similar workers' semi-military force would immediately find the entire engine of the State turned upon it to crush it as an intolerable outrage on the elementary principles of constitutional democracy? Why does the French Government protect the armed leagues of the Fascists? For the real trend of bourgeois opinion and policy the serious observer will do well to take note of the recent processes of the law courts in relation to Mosley. Mosley openly states in court his intention to use machine-guns under certain circumstances, and that it would be "easy to get them if occasion arose." It would not be difficult to imagine the outcry which would follow a similar statement from a worker's leader. But what is the reply of British justice? The Lord Chief Justice takes Mosley under his special protection and offers to him a certificate of high approval as "a public man of no mean courage, no little candour and no little ability." The workers will note with due attention this declaration—following on the aforesaid declaration of Mosley on the use of machine guns—of the highest impartial judicial voice of the British state machine. The policy of the British bourgeoisie in relation to Fascism and their future intentions stand plain for all to see.

A **GAINST** this gathering menace of capitalist attack, of fascism and of war, within which whole process the return of a Labour Government will only be a stage and a contributing factor, the only defence is the united strength of the working class. Never was there such need as in the midst of the present Labour electoral sweep for the revolutionary vanguard to maintain its independent leadership at the same time as fighting for the common front. *On this readiness of the revolutionary vanguard within the widest common front depends the readiness to meet Fascism.* Let there be no misunderstanding of the twofold character of this fight, which is in reality a single fight for the interests of the working class and of the working-class struggle. The united front of the working class against Fascism must be built up. This united front cannot be built

up, as some Labour supporters argue, on the basis of the Labour Party ("the united front is the Labour Party"); such an imaginary "united front" of electoral-parliamentary illusion and passivity will only end in disaster. The united front must be built up as the common struggle of the reformist and revolutionary workers in every sphere of the class struggle. The relative present size of the Labour Party and of the Communist Party is absolutely irrelevant to this real basic character of the united front. The Communist Party is to-day the only alternative political leadership of the working class to the Labour Party leadership. Only the combination of these two parties in a common front (including also the Independent Labour Party which represents a temporary section of the left workers) can unite and mobilise the entire forces of the working class, and bring back to the movement the energy and fighting power of the days of the Councils of Action of 1920. The majority of the workers to-day follow the Labour Party; the revolutionary workers are in a minority. The revolutionary workers recognise this; they are prepared to enter into a common front, recognising this, and are prepared to assist also in an electoral united front which will in fact assist the Labour Party to power. But it is essential that the alternative leadership to the Labour Party leadership, for the hour when the failure of this latter shall be plain to all, must already stand sharply defined before the working class. *It is essential that, as the exposure of reformism grows, the outcome must be, not disintegration and the drift to Fascism, but advance to the necessary revolutionary policy, to Communism, while maintaining the single mass united front.* This is the only path to the defeat of Fascism and to the victory of the working class in Britain. And the realisation of this depends on the simultaneous fight for the independent programme and policy and leadership of the Communist Party, and at the same time the fight for the common front in the actual struggle.

THE new electoral tactics of the Communist Party have won support in many quarters and criticism in some, but have been often misunderstood, also by some

supporters, as well as by critics. Where there has been misunderstanding, it has been a misunderstanding of them as an alternative to the line of independent leadership and a return to previous policies. On the contrary. The fight for the independence of the revolutionary vanguard has been fought and won in the critical years since 1928, and has been increasingly justified by the whole subsequent development and evolution of the Labour Party into a full social democratic party, leaving no freedom for revolutionary Marxist leadership within its ranks. To-day the independent mass leadership of the Communist Party, even though still limited in degree, is a fact, is a political factor, as shown in the Hunger March, in the strike movement, at Olympia and Hyde Park (the still continuing electoral weakness of the Communist Party should mislead none ; this is partly a reflection of the electoral inexperience and unskillfulness of the party, and partly a reflection of the deeply-rooted parliamentary traditions in the British working class, the non-understanding of the rôle of a revolutionary electoral party, and the essentially two-party character of the British parliamentary system). Whatever militant struggle develops in Britain to-day develops increasingly under the direct leadership and influence of the Communist Party. September 9 was above all significant as a demonstration of this new stage in the British working-class movement. The rôle of the Labour Party leadership becomes in certain respects analogous to that of the old Liberal Party leadership a quarter of a century ago, still holding the electoral majority of the working class, but with the class struggle developing in spite of them. But the trade union basis of the Labour Party makes the vital difference to this analogy ; and it is just here that the essential importance of the united front stands out in order to make possible the combined advance of the working class.

TO-DAY the issue in the present situation has reached to a further stage. The central issue to-day is the building of the united front of the entire forces of the working class for the gathering struggle against Fascism and against war. The Communist Party is taking the lead in

Britain as in every country in this fight for united action of the working class. And it is only because the Communist Party has established its independent leadership that it is able to take the lead in this fight for the united struggle of the working class against Fascism and war. On the future of this fight depends the future of the working class.

THE Labour Party and Trades Union Congress leadership are driving forward their counter-offensive against the united front. Southport was the counter-offensive to the united front. The Executive meeting of October 24—answering the Brussels joint meeting of October 15 and the declarations of Vandervelde and Adler in support of the united front in principle—was the counter-offensive to the united front. The rôle of the Labour Party delegation at Paris on November 15 was the counter-offensive to the united front. The Black Circular of the Trades Union Congress General Council, adopted at the meeting of October 24, to drive democratically elected militant delegates off the Trades Councils, is the counter-offensive to the united front. The fight is on. At the present moment the Trades Council issue expresses in principle the whole fight for the united front. Trades Council after Trades Council has already rejected the Black Circular. Two major Trade Unions have rejected it. Victory is possible, if all forces of the organised workers are mobilised to resist this attack. Such victory will mean the opening of a new era in the working class movement.

THE Spanish workers in the Central Prison of Madrid, socialist, communist, anarchist and non-party, have addressed a common letter to the workers of other countries. In that letter they call for the aid of the international working class, for “united front action” of the workers of all countries. In that letter they declare :

Comrades ! the only guarantee of victory is the realisation of the united front of the workers and peasants of every tendency, the ever closer alliance of all the exploited.

That is the message of the Spanish workers who have fought and suffered to the workers of every country. We must not fail the Spanish workers. We must not fail the workers of all lands. We must not fail the workers of Britain. The fight for the united front must be fought and won, if the whole movement is not to go down in disintegration and defeat. The entire united working class movements of country after country in Europe are with us and wishing us godspeed in the fight against the reactionary machine which is throttling equally their efforts towards the international united front. Let us make the present stage of the issue, the fight for the united trades councils against the reactionary splitting circular, the turning-point to the victory of the united front all along the line. The fight for the united front in Britain is the key fight for the international united front, and a heavy responsibility rests on the workers in Britain.

R. P. D.

R. PALME DUTT

contributes an article on

“The British Labour Party Conference at Southport”
to the current *Communist International*. (No. 22).

This number also includes a special supplement consisting of an article entitled “The Problems of the International Trade Union Movement,” being the full text of a speech by O. Piatnitsky, Secretary to the E.C.C.I., given before a special session of members of the Red International of Labour Unions. Other articles include a section of Discussion articles for the forthcoming Seventh Congress of the Communist International ; also “Marxism in the Service of British Imperialism,” being a detailed review of “Why War ?” by E. Wilkinson and E. Conze.

Threepence (post free) from any Workers Bookshop or direct from 38 Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.1.