

NOTES OF THE MONTH

United Front Advance—Power of Mass Movement—Labour Party Rôle—After the Battle—“ All Sections ”—Sheffield—Bourgeois Panic-Talk—Economic Setback—Lloyd George Campaign—Lloyd George and Fascism—Diehards and Fascism—Towards Fascist Concentration—South Wales’ Lead for United Front—Problems of Organisation—Next Issues of Struggle—Future Election Questions—Rising Battle.

THE United Front has won its first victories—and the whole political situation is becoming transformed. The wave of mass revolt against the new unemployment scales, leading to the confusion and temporary retreat of the National Government in the beginning of February, is the biggest development in Britain since Invergordon and the fights of the autumn of 1931. The significance of this development is first, that it has been directly led by the new united front leadership, by the Communist Party, Independent Labour Party, National Unemployed Workers’ Movement and the local working-class organisations, in the face of the open opposition of the Labour Party leadership (the Labour Party leaders only coming out to voice “ public opinion ” at each stage after the fight was over and the victory had been won) ; second, that it has for the first time since the establishment of the National Government in 1931 shaken the position of the National Government, despite all its overwhelming parliamentary majority, and compelled the beginning of a retreat, with the corresponding gain of enormous confidence to the working class ; and third, that this advance of the mass struggle is having big repercussions on the whole economic political situation in Britain (setback to the capitalist “ recovery ” hopes, Conservative revolt, new Lloyd George manœuvres, preparation for National Government “ reconstruction ”), which open

the outlook to far-reaching changes and shifting of forces in the near future. *The united front is advancing, and we need already to be looking forward to the next stages of the fight.* The success of the Communist Party Congress, with its demonstration of strength and closeness to the mass movement ; the great South Wales United Front Conference on January 26, with its 1,600 delegates ; the similar united front conferences all over the country (illustrated also in the splendid response to the LABOUR MONTHLY United Front Conference, reported elsewhere in this issue) : all these are signs of the times and of the advance of the movement. We are entering into a new stage of the mass fight against capitalism, against the National Government and against Fascism.

THE *Power of the Mass Movement*—that is the first and biggest fact about the events which have signalled the opening of 1935 in Britain. The new unemployment scales were announced in December, 1934. On January 3, 1935, was issued the joint call of the Communist Party and the Independent Labour Party to united front struggle against the new attack. On January 7 the new Unemployment Assistance Board, of men drawing salaries of many thousands a year to cut down the shillings of the starving unemployed, took over, and the new scales came into force. The old already barest subsistence poor law scales were slashed right and left ; the family means test (*i.e.*, the system of throwing the burden of the maintenance of the unemployed on to the low paid employed workers, in order to save the pockets of the rich) was enforced with a ruthlessness hitherto unequalled. The mass struggle against this most brutal attack of the National Government broke out with overwhelming force over the whole country ; demonstrations and marches took place, of 60,000 in the Rhondda, of 40,000 in Dowlais, of 20,000 in Glasgow, of 20,000 in Pontypridd, of 30,000 in Aberdare, of 10,000 in North Shields, culminating in the great South Wales united front conference, under the auspices of the South Wales Miners' Federation, with 1,600 delegates and revealing the rising drive

to strike action on a national scale. The South Wales Conference took place on January 26. On January 28 the House of Commons—the same House of Commons which had complacently passed the Unemployment Act in 1934 and sanctioned the new Board as taking unemployment relief “out of politics” revealed a sudden “stirring” of the “people’s representatives” in a carefully staged united outcry of Conservative M.P.s, Liberal M.P.s and Labour M.P.s against the new regulations. On January 29 the Government announced its intention to make concessions. The mass agitation grew in force. On February 5 the Government announced the complete temporary suspension of the new scales; “the interim system would not be legal, but would be covered by an Act of Indemnity.” Immediately after, there followed the second stage of the fight, led by Sheffield. The Government sought still to enforce the new scales for one week further. The Sheffield workers fought; when the Sheffield majority Labour Council refused to receive the workers’ deputation, they surrounded the Town Hall; the police charged the workers, making wholesale arrests; but within twenty-four hours of that struggle the Government sanctioned the immediate application of the new standstill order to Sheffield, and thereafter was compelled to extend it to the whole country. *Never was there a clearer demonstration of the power of mass action to override all constitutional forms.* The fight is not over, but only begun; the Government is still endeavouring to go back on its promises and maintain modified forms of the cuts in one way or another; Part II. of the Unemployment Act is still on the Statute Book; but the path of the workers’ struggle to victory has already been shown.

WHERE was the Labour Party leadership in this glorious fight of the British working class? Where was the Trades Union Congress General Council? The record stands plain for all to see. Right through January the workers fought alone—in face of the ban of the Labour Party and T.U.C. General Council. Turn to the *Labour Magazine* for February, prepared in mid-January. There is not one word on the fight against the Unemployment Assistance Board and the new

scales. Turn to the *Labour Woman* for February. The editorial remarks placidly with regard to the new scales that "the new scheme for the stabilisation of poverty is working according to plan" (not much "according to plan" by the time the workers had got moving, when the journal appeared); it recounts piteous cases reported to it: "these cases are typical," What is the conclusion? A call to action? To fight the new attack? To defeat it? On the contrary. The conclusion peacefully urges that "it may be argued that it is not fair to judge the new scheme so soon," but that "the future will certainly confirm what is already pretty clear: that no halfway house will ever be satisfactory." No hint of action, no hint of struggle, no hint of the bare possibility of defeating the new attack.

ONLY *after* the mass struggle had fought through the battle without them, after the Communists and the I.L.P., whose call to the united front for the fight in the beginning of January they had refused, had led the battle, *after even Conservative M.P.s and Liberal M.P.s* under the power of the mass pressure had raised their protest on January 28 against the new regulations, *after the Government* on January 29 had announced its retreat, only then on February 1 the National Council of Labour came out with its solemn Manifesto to "all well disposed citizens" to concern themselves with "this lamentable state of affairs": "the Bishop of Malmesbury has said . . . a great and generous nation like ours . . . undermining some of the most sacred traditions of our land . . . to remove this blot from our national reputation," and similar nauseating servilities, in place of leadership of the struggle.

MORE than this. On January 29 Lansbury, leader of the Labour Party, under the impetus of the mass movement fell for a moment into older phraseology, forgot Southport, forgot the sacred bans and vetoes, forgot the Bishop of Malmesbury, and let slip the declaration that "*we hope that all sections of the British Labour Movement will unite*" against "the wholesale starvation of men, women,

and children.” What did this mean? What was the meaning of the demand that “all sections” should “unite”? Swiftly on the heels of this declaration, on January 30 the Communist Party and I.L.P. wrote to the Labour Party, on the basis of this declaration of the leader of the Labour Party, to

Urge at this critical moment of the history of the working class to make this need for united action the major consideration. We on our part will do everything possible to remove any barriers that can stand in the way of our coming together.

On January 31 came the reply of the Labour Party that “it was decided that no action should be taken thereon.” And on February 1 came the Manifesto “to all leaders of public opinion . . . in no partisan spirit” (*i.e.*, the call for the united front with the bourgeoisie in place of the united front of the working class).

THEN followed Sheffield. The Sheffield workers found themselves faced, not only with the police and the National Government, but with the majority Labour Council which refused to receive their deputation. The battle of the Sheffield workers, which won the victory for the whole country, was fought in the face of the open opposition of the official Labour leadership. “The march . . . had not the sanction of the official Labour Movement” (*Daily Herald*, February 7, 1935). On February 7 came the surrender of the Government. On February 8 followed the second Manifesto of the National Council of Labour, published in the press of February 9, that “demonstrations are being organised in all parts of the country under the auspices of the National Council of Labour . . . the Council take the view that pressure must be maintained upon the Government.” What is this rôle save at every stage, first to hinder and ban the actual struggle, and then, when the battle has been fought and won in spite of their opposition, to come out with a loud crowing and songs of victory, in the hope to hinder the next stage of the struggle? This is the situation which the rank-and-file workers must change, if the full force of the working class is to be thrown into the struggle.

NO less important was the effect on the bourgeoisie of this advance of the mass struggle. The effect was most sharply revealed in the universal slogan "No Panic" which was sounded in the entire bourgeois press during the second week of February. The demoralisation of the Government reached its height on the critical day, February 8, when the puppet Prime Minister was compelled to declare that, with regard to the retreat of the Government, "he only knew about it when he opened his newspaper" and that he "had been trying all the morning to get into touch" with his own Minister, *i.e.*, the Conservative Government in action had no time to waste on its "National Labour" façade. The governmental *Times* was compelled to comment on "the impression of lack of cohesion, lack of decision and lack of calm" as highly "unfortunate" (*Times* editorial on "Revision without Panic," February 11, 1935). Two days later the theme of "panic" returns :

The breakdown of the regulations suggests the need for fresh resolution rather than for panic. Nevertheless, panic has raised its head. (*Times*, February 13, 1935.)

Sterling and British securities slumped. The simultaneous revelations of the speculation crisis, the announcement of the increase of unemployment by a quarter of a million, and the Wavertree by-election, with the powerful Conservative revolt and consequent return of the Labour candidate, who publicly stated that "the triumph of Labour was a reflection of the tremendous volume of protest aroused throughout the country by the Unemployment Assistance Board regulations," all combined

To fray people's nerves and to weaken confidence. Rumours were set going which in an exaggerated form were circulated very widely on the Continent. . . . They came at a time when the unfortunate trouble over unemployment relief and the outcry which it provoked, together with the result of the Wavertree election, had created a background which made it easier for them to gain credence. (*Times*, February 14, 1935.)

Next day the *Times* was again compelled to note

Recent signs of a decline of confidence in the continuation of industrial recovery and of British credit. . . . The fall in British

Government securities on the Stock Exchange reflects nervousness both at home and abroad.

World opinion was beginning to form the "illusion" that

"Once again Great Britain is on the verge of catastrophe. *Sauve qui peut.*" (*Times*, February 15, 1935.)

THE advance of the mass struggle coincided with a new stage in the economic crisis. The setback to the very limited "recovery" had already been manifest since the second half of 1934. Industrial production in the capitalist world as a whole for the entire year 1934 was already 24 per cent. below the level of 1929, while in the Soviet Union it was 239 per cent. above the level of 1929 (Molotov at the Seventh Soviet Congress). But the second half of 1934 began to reveal a new downward trend. For the prospect of 1935 the Federation of British Industries business forecast drew the gloomy conclusion that

The "prosperity phase" of the present short-run business cycle is drawing to its close even in countries which, like Japan, have received the most benefit from the period of recovery. It is thought that efforts during the coming year are likely to be increasingly directed to measures for maintaining the general level of activity by such means as Government-promoted schemes of work and financial assistance, and various devices of an inflationary money character. In regard to the former, it is observed that there is abundant evidence to show that, in general, public works can never be set going on a substantial scale; in regard to the latter, that, while it is certainly true that inflation can for a time maintain prosperity, in the long run it invariably brings its own nemesis of loss.

The Journal of the Associated Chambers of Commerce for January reported a "slackening off" in the rate of trade improvement:

He would be a rash man who ventured to predict for 1935 more than the maintenance of the existing position with some slowing down of the rate of advance as the impetus given to home trades by tariffs becomes more remote . . . and the situation to-day does not inspire one to deny the immediate possibility of such a setback.

The speculative forces behind the previous minor "boom" were partially revealed in the "pepper crisis" at the beginning

of February, exposing some of the principal heads of finance-capital as engaged in disreputable transactions, even by the standards of capitalist ethics, to rake in gamblers' profits behind the façade of National Government "recovery." On January 28 the unemployment figure revealed an increase of 240,000 on the previous month, a rate of increase only partially explained by seasonal causes, and resulting in a total of 2,325,273, or within 63,000 of January, 1934. At the same time the suspension of the new cuts is stated to be expected to cost at the rate of £4,500,000 to £5,000,000 a year ; it had thus been expected to extract this further amount from the unemployed (under cover of the lying promises of giving an additional £3,000,000 a year), and this money has now to be found, with the consequent sharpened problem for the State finances, in view of the steeply mounting armaments demands. *In view of this it is certain that, behind the temporary enforced retreat, the National Government will fight hard to re-impose the cuts in one form or another, and that new struggles are in front.*

IT is against this background that the new political moves in the bourgeois camp take on their significance. These moves are characterised by (1) the Lloyd George campaign ; (2) the right wing Conservative revolt ; (3) the preparations for a "reconstruction" of the National Government. What is common to all these moves ? Their common characteristic is *preparation for an intensified phase of class struggle, and consequent alternative plans to strengthen the bourgeois front.* It should be noted that the Lloyd George campaign has already passed through two entirely distinct phases, before the present intensified stage of class struggle, and after. When the "Plan" was originally announced with a flourish of trumpets in December, it was directed entirely and openly to the Labour Party and a prospective Labour-Liberal alliance. Significant of this was the fact that the original announcements and special interviews were exclusive to the *Daily Herald* and *News-Chronicle*. In his interview with the *Daily Herald* (December 15, 1934), Lloyd George appealed for "a Government of the Left," put the "Nationalisation" of the Bank of England in the foreground

(“ the Bank of England must become a real State bank ”), and declared :

Labour will win a big victory at the next General Election. . . .

Here is as much work as any Government of the Left can do in five years. Why can't we get together to do it ?

Equally significant was the original warm welcome given in the first days by official Labour expression. When the first sign of the new move was made by his speech in Parliament on December 13,

Mr. Lloyd George sat down amid Labour cheering that was loud and warm. (*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, December 21, 1934.)

The *Daily Herald* editorial (December 15, 1934), found that he was only saying what “ the leaders of the Labour Party have been saying for a long time ” :

The main thing is that so far as can be seen Mr. Lloyd George on one essential is in full accord with the Labour Party

Lansbury in his speech at Mitcham on December 15 stated :

If Mr. Lloyd George and his friends want to help replan, help us to reorganise British industry and get back the land and the minerals of the country into the hands of the whole nation, we shall welcome their help. (*Daily Herald*, December 17, 1934.)

BUT in January developed the new intensified phase of class struggle, with the advance of the united working-class front. At once the tone of Lloyd George changed. When the campaign opened with the Bangor speech on January 17, an entirely different note was sounded. The nationalisation of the Bank of England disappeared. The call was now given for (1) “ a much stronger line ” in foreign policy ; (2) “ ruthless ” use of tariffs ; (3) a War Cabinet : “ I would restore the principle of the old War Cabinet ” ; (4) utilisation of “ the immense opportunities offered by our Colonial Empire ” ; (5) a “ Prosperity Loan ” and National Investment Board, but no nationalisation of the Joint Stock Banks. In place of the advocacy of “ a Government of the Left,” the demand was now for an efficient “ National Government ” : “ I will support a National Government as long as it grapples effectively with the national emergency ” (Birmingham speech, January 26). The warmest welcome now came from Conservative and Fascist circles, and

the intrigues developed to include Lloyd George in the National Government. In this quick change-over of the canny chameleon, Lloyd George, may be seen reflected the change-over of influential forces of bourgeois opinion from the hopes of deluding the workers by a reform programme through a Labour or Liberal-Labour Government succeeding the present Government, to recognition of the dangerous awakening united struggle of the workers and the consequent determination instead to strengthen the united bourgeois front or "National" front. This issue cannot yet be regarded as decided in the bourgeois camp; further manœuvres and shiftings may be expected, including of Lloyd George.

EVEN more direct is the significance of the growth of the Right Conservative revolt. The gathering fight against the leadership of Baldwin takes on a certain resemblance to the old successful fight against the leadership of Balfour in the pre-war period, just as the attack on the principle of Coalition resembles the old successful offensive against the Coalition in 1922. There could be no greater mistake than to under-estimate the strength of the Right Conservatives, because they appear at the moment still in a minority. If their rôle is carefully analysed throughout the imperialist epoch (the overthrow of Balfour, the Ulster revolt, the overthrow of the Coalition in 1922, etc.), it will be seen that they have repeatedly and increasingly had their way and proved themselves the driving force of modern Conservatism, that is, of the almost monopolist party of the modern bourgeoisie. The diehards are no longer merely the camp of the old decaying landlord-aristocratic-military reaction. To-day they are supplemented by the most aggressive forces of modern finance-capital, by a Churchill, leading the international White Guard, by a Lloyd, embodying British imperialist rule, by a Rothermere, with his jingo press octopus, and on the outer wing, but in close relations with all these, by a Mosley and the open Fascists. India is only the key centre (for British Imperialism, the typical and inevitable key centre), of a deeper fight, a fight against all parliamentary-democratic institutions and for intensified dictatorship. At

the Bristol Conference of the Conservative Party last autumn the Churchill-Lloyd leadership won 520 votes against 543 for the Government. It is true that at the December Special Conference the Government succeeded in carrying the Joint Select Committee's Report by 1,102 to 390 (revealing a rock-bottom strength for the right wing of 26 per cent.), but this was only after all the essence of their demands had in reality been granted by the enormous strengthening of the "safeguards." The parliamentary vote on the second reading of the India Bill still showed 79 Conservatives voting against the Government (plus 3 pairing against the Government, or a total of 82). The Wavertree election showed 10,535 voting for the Right Conservatives, even at the cost of letting Labour in, against 13,771 for the official Conservative. All these signs are a portent of the advance to Fascism in Britain.

THE significance of the moves to a "reconstruction" of the National Government thus stand out clearly. Between the apparent direct opposition of the different camps on this question lies a basic unity of policy. One wing seeks reconstruction by the inclusion of Lloyd George, that is, by strengthening the coalition or "national" character of the National Government. The other wing, on the contrary, represented by the Right Conservatives and Rothermere, seeks to replace the existing coalition by an open Conservative Government, with the inclusion of Churchill and the Right Conservatives. Yet in both cases the basic objective is the same—to strengthen the bourgeois front against the rising united working-class front. The Fascists, Rothermere, Churchill and Lloyd hunt in a pack together. But the Fascists at the same time openly applaud Lloyd George ("Whither Lloyd George? Will he march in the Spirit of the Modern Age? . . . the first steps on the road towards Fascist conclusions"—*Blackshirt*, December 21, 1934). Lloyd George openly points to the Nazi Government as the model, just as Lloyd George openly defended the Fascists at Olympia. Thus the formal difference between the two lines of reconstruction is only the

difference between two alternative (and not in the end necessarily incompatible) methods of strengthening and concentrating the bourgeois front. *Both alike point with increasing clearness along the Fascist road, to which the British bourgeoisie is moving with increasing consciousness.*

WHAT, then, must be the answer of the working class to this increasingly open Fascist line of development of the bourgeoisie? *There can be only one answer. That answer is the united working-class front.* The advance of the united working-class front in the past two months, both in the process of the struggle and within the lower working-class organisations, is enormous. But the central machine of the National Labour Council still seeks to block the way; and in consequence the organised strength of the great mass organisations of the working class is not yet brought into the struggle. Only in South Wales has the effective united front of all working-class organisations, without distinction, come close to complete realisation, smashing all bans; and the resultant tremendous advance for the whole working class has been manifest throughout the country. In South Wales the leaders of the Labour Party and of the trade unions are finding themselves compelled to speak on one platform with the Communists; the paper writs of Transport House are crumbling against the mighty rock of working-class solidarity. But this smashing of the bans needs to be achieved throughout the country. South Wales is once again leading, as many times in British working-class history. *South Wales has shown the way for the whole country. What has been achieved in South Wales needs to be achieved throughout Britain.*

THE demand for nation-wide organisation of the united front spreads apace. It was noticeable that at the London United Front Conference convened by the LABOUR MONTHLY on January 26, and representing 257 delegates from local Labour Parties, trade unions, co-operatives and political working-class organisations, as well as student and cultural organisations, the demand was widely expressed for definite

organising steps, and for the election of a provisional committee already at this limited conference to organise the campaign, draw in the local Labour Parties, trade unions, co-operatives and other organisations, and link up with similar committees throughout the country ; and there was some impatience expressed at the insistence on the necessity first to build up the united front in the localities. These questions will be further considered at the Second United Front Conference which it was unanimously decided by the January Conference to recommend to be held in the near future, with mandated delegates. The existence of this strong demand for further organising steps is an important sign of the times. Undoubtedly we cannot be satisfied to remain on the basis of the local organisation of the united front, with occasional conferences. We need to advance to the future nation-wide all-embracing united front, to the future anti-Fascist Front, which shall combine the mass of the workers with all militant anti-fascist elements, and constitute the unconquerable bulwark against Fascism. For this purpose we need to be already organising provisionally in all the districts of the country, as is already being done in many districts and areas through united front conferences and Unity Committees. But we need at the same time to beware of allowing the aim of the united front to be replaced by any sectional, isolated national organisation, representing only a minority, and only playing into the hands of Transport House and its bans. Our aim is to win the mass of the workers to the united struggle. For this reason our essential task at the present stage is to build the united working-class front in the localities and in the process of the struggle, not merely in the sense of drawing together delegates from organisations, but in the sense of drawing the mass of the workers into common struggle, and at the same time building mass anti-fascist formations in the localities. The experience of France has shown the fruitfulness of this path of advance. On this basis, as the movements develops, we shall overcome all obstacles and advance to the nation-wide all-embracing united front.

THE present issues of the struggle in the period immediately ahead confront us with all urgency. In the forefront stands the fight against Part II. of the Unemployment Act. The Government is preparing, under cover of the temporary suspension, to issue new regulations on the same basic principles, and to fight for them ; is indeed already whittling away the effects of the promised suspension by subsequent rulings, as on the question of supplementary allowances. The call to the future fight is openly sounded in the Minister of Labour's declaration that "the regulations are sound in principle," as in the *Times*' warning (February 11, 1935).

There is clearly a danger that *when the time comes for the amended regulations to be presented, they will be greeted with a similar outcry*, however much they may be proof against legitimate criticism, at a time when the Government will certainly not find agitation any easier to resist. . . . Pressure directed to the abolition of a Means Test must be firmly resisted.

This new and wider stage of the battle is opened by the February 24 demonstrations. At the same time we cannot afford to leave out of view the parallel phases of the Government's attack, which have been temporarily held up by the strength of the workers' resistance, in particular, the "Shorter Hours" attack, or proposed system of wage-sharing between employed and unemployed workers' in the name of "shorter hours," as foreshadowed by the Government's interview with the Trades Union Congress General Council on January 24. In the words of Hudson, the Parliamentary Secretary of Labour :

What we think ought to be done in this country is to see, industry by industry, whether it is possible to shorten hours without reducing wages, and *if it is not possible to do it without reducing wages, to see what sacrifices the employers or the men respectively are prepared to make.*

With this may be compared the semi-official statement on behalf of the Ministry in the *Times* of January 9 :

It is recognised that industries which encounter international competition in neutral markets will not be able to bear the increase in working costs ; that a reduction in working time without reduction of wages would entail. When, therefore, the first aspect of the question has been considered, the Minister will next enquire whether,

if it is impossible to pay the same wages for less working time without loss, the employers and the workpeople would be prepared *to make sacrifices in order to increase the numbers employed.*

It is certain that, as the setback to the "recovery" illusions becomes pronounced, it will be followed by an intensified capitalist attack in the whole economic field, alongside the intensified attack in the political field (preparations for press censorship, etc.). This can only be met by the resistance of the united working-class front.

ALONGSIDE this developing fight we need to prepare for the future electoral fight. Our aim is to bring the united front fight into the elections, to make the united front fight the centre of the electoral fight. For this it is necessary to prepare beforehand, and not after the elections are announced. In every constituency the workers need to come together. Where there are Communist candidates, who are already fighting for the united front, it is necessary to strengthen preparations now (remembering that we have not the same financial resources as the Government parties to conduct an intensive propaganda campaign in the last weeks of an election, and therefore everything depends on the previous preparation), in order to return a body of tried Communist fighters to the next Parliament to transform the character of the fight in Parliament and combine with it the fight outside. At the same time here are already 450 Labour candidates in the field. It is necessary to bombard every one of these Labour candidates and the local parties with the call to enter into the united front fight and to adopt a united front platform for the elections ; where there is resistance, it is necessary to work to change the candidates in order to ensure that the election fight shall be on the basis of the united front. Our aim must be to transform the election fight from a reformist Labour fight on the basis of the Southport programme to a united front fight on a united front platform of working-class policy, against capitalism and the National Government, for the demands of the working class, and on this basis to utilise the elections to carry forward the united working-class struggle.

“**W**E are on the eve of great events, of great struggles.” This declaration of the Manifesto of the Communist Party Congress will be abundantly justified by the coming period. Abroad we are faced by the hastening war preparations, by the now universal acceptance of German re-armament, the closer German-Japanese-Polish alliance against the Soviet Union, and the schemes of British Imperialism to further this policy through the London agreement. The gathering of the forces of the working class has been shown in the February 12 demonstrations in Austria, and in the new united front agreement at last reached in Germany. In Britain the National Government is heavily shaken by the worsening economic situation and by the rising wave of working-class resistance. The attack of capitalism under these conditions becomes intensified, not because the capitalists are stronger, but because they become ever more conscious of the rising contradictions with which they are faced. In this situation the united working-class front is with growing triumphs demonstrating the path forward, for the massing of all the forces of the workers for the fight and the preparation of the future revolutionary struggles. After the first conflicts of the opening of the present year, after the first demonstrations of the power of the mass movement, we can go forward with the greater confidence ; for the path of advance is clear before us.

R. P. D.