The significance of this interview is therefore nothing but an open announcement of the coup d'État for the coming Autumn, whereby the character of the action will depend chiefly upon the amount of resistance put up by the working class. In this sense, the making of a fascist putsch in Autumn is being seriously discussed at the moment in the whole of Austria and a section of the foreign press. On the 23rd August the “Neues Wiener Journal” a journal connected with the Heimwehr movement, reprinted in great make up an article of the Milan “Sera” of the 23rd August in which it deplores the measures that the occupation of Vienna by the Heimwehr army will take place towards the end of September, and with comparative ease as the Vienna police would declare themselves “neutral”.

A considerable part of the discussion is devoted to the question of the putting of the constitution, because the fascist Heimwehr leaders have declared again and again that any constitutional action will only be taken if the National Council proves unable to make alterations in the constitution calculated to assist the victory of real democracy.

This “real democracy” plays in the ideology of the Austrian fascists much the same role as Mussolini’s phrases about “the unpatriciotic bourgeoisie which thinks only of its stomach played in Italy. One would not go far wrong in declaring that the Austrian social democracy itself is the source of this fascist ideology. It must not be forgotten that it was the Austrian socialist democratic leader Renner who as Prime Minister of Austria and shortly afterwards of the election of “bourgeois councils” as a counterweight to the workers councils in the interests of this same “democracy”.

Speaking in the same spirit Steidle declared on the 18th August in Linz: “Democracy means the unification of all the forces of the whole people for the State as a whole, and at the same time for the economic and political, and the guarantee for the freedom of the people and continuous liberty for all citizens.” In order however, that his hearers should not misunderstand him, Steidle added immediately: “But as good democrats we will have no tolerance for Marxism. In this respect we will recognize only a ruthless struggle until it has been burned out.”

What the fascists understand by “real democracy”, that is to say, what alterations the fascists wish to make in the constitution, is shown in a leading article in the “Neues Wiener Journal” on the 23rd August. According to this article the peace programme of the Austrian bourgeoisie has the following points: first of all a change in the position of the President of the Republic. Instead of acting merely as a figurehead the President should be given real powers. A further point refers to Vienna and demands, inter alia, the complete independence of the Police from the Vienna Municipal Council. Facilitating facilities and the reduction of the social burdens in the interests of as many people as possible. Also the wage disputes as far as wages have already exceeded the minimum level. The passing of an anti-terror law. This means a law which robs the workers of the right to defend themselves against strike-breakers, yellow and fascists of all sorts, and which devotes the right of combination for the working class. A prohibition against striking by public employees and civil servants. Abolition of the socialist press terror. Theabolition of the list system of election for parliament in order to permit prominent leaders of Austrian economy to enter parliament.

This programme of the Austrian bourgeoisie thus confirms the essence of the development in Austria set up by the Communist Party: either graduated depression or a program of fascism. In view of the progressive radicalization of the Austrian working class it is becoming more and more unlikely that the Austrian fascists will be able to gain control of the State apparatus and rob the workers of their rights “peacefully” and without meeting with much resistance.

Despite the supercilious tone with which Steidle is wont to refer to Streurwitz, there is no doubt that the government is also making preparations to throw the forces of the State against the workers in the decisive moment.

In the recent Cabinet session which dealt with the events in St. Lorenzen a number of measures were decided upon, according to press reports, which lie quite in this direction.

The national police force is to be strengthened by 2,000 men and it is further intended that the national police shall replace the urban police in the most important industrial centres. This means that Herr Schober wants to establish detachments of fascist guards in the Austrian working class quarters, which, in case of civil war, would immediately appear on the scene as well-equipped armies for the conduct of civil war.

Li is a further step is to be strengthened numerically and better equipped both with regard to arms and means of transport and communication (flying-squad automobiles, portable wireless stations etc.).

A garrison of the Austrian army is to be established in Bruck on the Mur. Formerly there were three garrisons in Upper Styria, one in Judenburg, another in Leoben and the third in Bruck. As however the soldiers of the two last named towns continually fraternised with the workers and elected a communist to represent them, these garrisons were removed to Graz. Now however the War Minister Vaugoin thinks that his soldiers are so safe in the hands of his officers that he can send soldiers to Bruck for a little bloodbath amongst the workers.

These measures of the government, the unmistakable preparations for civil war show even more clearly than the speeches of Dr. Steidle how near we are in Austria to decisive struggles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The Watch on the Suez.


By J. B., Jerusalem.

With grand gestures and many phrases the Labour Party is endeavouring to represent the project of the treaty, which Mohammed Mahmoud, the Egyptian dictator by the grace of Britain, and Henderson have worked out together, as a “friendly solution” of the Anglo-Egyptian conflicts. This “leftward” gesture is all the more suspicious, because in other important matters this government has shown an Indian question, nothing is happening which could be regarded as a deviation from conservative traditions. On closer inspection, however, it is evident that in the Egyptian policy too, the Mahmoud-Henderson project is by no means so revolutionary as it is judged by the advertisement in the “Daily Herald” and from the first glance it might be described as “the evacuation of Egypt by the British troops”. Even the last State crisis, which broke out in conjunction with the establishing of the Mahmoud dictatorship in Egypt. (July 1928), proved that the presence of British troops in the Nile Valley is quite without object: the English troops did not even appear on the streets; it was sufficient that they could be transported to Cairo in a few hours to paralyse any revolutionary action. It is true that the troops are to leave their stations near Cairo and Alexandria, but — and this time with the voluntary assent of the Egyptian Government — they are to be concentrated close to the Suez Canal and still on Egyptian territory and at places which are hardly more than a two-hours’ motor drive from Cairo; the number of troops is to remain the same (Executive supplement to the treaty project). What remains of the evacuation? Nothing but a repetition of the British withdrawal in the Egyptian Government — from their present station to others in Egyptian territory, which in many respects are strategically still more favourable for the English than the present positions.

The second question in dispute, the Sudan question, is to be “magnanimously” settled by a return to the state of affairs existing prior to the infamous Allenby ultimatum in the year 1917. A formal condemnation of the country’s annexation in the Sudan. Not, however, in all parts, for the 300,000 feddan of cotton growing territory has in the meanwhile been swallowed.

By P. (Moskow).

The government of the Labour Party has its policy at the Hague fully deserved the title of a "national government", i.e. a government of the national bourgeoisie. Snowden's tactics met with the warmest sympathy even of the conservative bourgeoisie and was accorded its full approval. It would have been difficult for Chamberlain and Baldwin to have defended the cause of British imperialism with greater zeal. Henderson's activity meets with no less approval, for these two "Labour leaders" supplement one another at the Hague. Their activity is directed to the interests of the capitalist regime to cause difficulties to France and regain for England the position of arbitrator in European affairs, which position was lost under Chamberlain. But the position of the social democratic parties whose countries are the victim of Snowden's policy has become really difficult. The French bourgeoisie plainly asks the socialists members of the Labour Government, in carrying out the orders of the English bourgeoisie, have seriously damaged the interests of the French bourgeoisie. Léon Blum is therefore very stern with Snowden on this occasion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has, it appears, violated the resolutions of the Second International.

Two less than any other — writes Blum — have reason to regret that the English socialist party have not been able to compel the English socialist government to utilise those ideas which they accepted as a section of the International... Snowden is wrong, in the first place, because his manners awake evil passion, in the second place, however, he is still more wrong in regard to the essentials of the question."

The French socialists have, therefore, not betrayed their "national interests", i.e. the interests of their bourgeoisie. They regard Snowden as a "betrayal of the resolutions of the Second International".

The Austrian Social Democrats are, on the other hand, not interested in reparations, but they are antagonistic towards France. In their ranks the actions of the English delegation do not call forth so much bitterness as they do in Léon Blum.

"It is true — writes the Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung" of August 15th —, the English Labour government thereby denies not only one to the social democrats, but voices the demands of the English State and, therefore, those of English capital, too. But does this defence of the national interests run counter to their international obligations?... The English socialists are, like the socialists of all other countries, prepared to put these resolutions (the resolutions of the Second International on the reparations question, Ed.) into effect at the earliest possible opportunity. But as long as the political relations of Europe and, chiefly, as long as the power of American capital, to which England itself must pay tribute, makes the fulfilment of these