

Growth of Fascism in England

Edinburgh.—The advent of Hitlerism has given the impetus to the formation of Fascist groups in Britain. Brown Shirt, Blue Shirt, Green Shirt and Black Shirt organizations are coming into existence in different parts of the country and all of them seek to emulate Herr Hitler.

In Scotland, a Scottish Fascist party has been formed under the leadership of Wm Gilmour, a former member of the Labour party. This group plays upon the religious and nationalist feelings of the Scottish workers by calling upon them to support such things as Home Rule for Scotland and the expulsion of the Roman Catholics from Scotland, while Gilmour also advocates the formation of a Scottish industrial union.

In London, a Green Shirt organization has come forward with an appeal to the youth of England. The young men and women must save the British Empire from ruin by means of supporting the much discussed currency scheme known as the Douglas Credit System which, once adopted would bring prosperity to the shores of Britain.

The outstanding personality in the ranks of the British Fascists, however, is Sir Oswald Mosley, another former member of the Labour Party and a member of the Labour government. He has organized a Black shirt group known as the British Union of Fascists and in the capacity of propagandist he has published a book in which he outlined the main features of the Corporative State. Mosley has paid several visits to Italy and is a great admirer of Mussolini.

However he sees certain flaws in Italian Fascism and he would remedy these weaknesses upon the basis of rationalized British industry with a new political structure adapted to British traditions. The monarchy would be retained as the great unifying force in the Empire but the House of Lords would be abolished as being antiquated and in place of the present Corporation elected from the best brains in banking, industry and politics. The state would settle all industrial disputes and the trade unions would be forbidden to strike but would be called upon to aid the state in the reconstruction of industry. In order to achieve this delightful scheme of things, the forces of anarchy must be overcome. And Mosley sums up this part of the program as meaning the struggle against Communism which must first of all be destroyed in Fascism is to triumph.

All the Fascist groups take up this latter point with great enthusiasm. Their literature abounds with threats against prominent Communists who are being at the root of all the troubles that afflict mankind and especially the British Empire. The numerical strength of the Fascists is uncertain but they probably number 10,000 and are mean-time the favorite theme of music hall comedians and the popular cartoonists. But despite this ridicule they have started actively to interfere with strikes and Communist meetings and are obviously being financed by certain sections of the capitalist class. Their main recruiting ground is the middle class and the lumpen-proletariat—quite a useful combination for any dirty work—and their ranks are likely to be considerably strengthened as the crisis deepens or if the working class should swing to the Left.

The numerical weakness of Fascism is in direct contradiction to the tremendous interest that is being taken in the subject of Fascism in general. The popular press devotes whole pages to the development of Hitlerism in Germany and each new atrocity against Jew or Communist is justified or condemned in line with the particular policy being pursued by the given newspaper. Hitler is written up as a hero or a villain. His policy is praised by the Daily Mail or vigorously attacked by the Manchester Guardian. The latter newspaper has led the field in the matter of exposures of German Fascism and unlike the organs of the Labour party, the Daily Herald, has made the defense of Jew or Communist a special feature. While in contradistinction to the organ of the Communist party, the Daily Worker, it has found space for the brilliant analysis of the German situation by comrade Trotsky although it took pains to point out that it disagrees with Trotsky's belief in the world revolution.

All the political parties have discussed the Fascist question and they are all in opposition to Fascism but the organs of the Conservative party advise the youth of Britain to watch and learn from Hitler whose easy triumph is welcomed with ill-concealed delight. The rapidly decomposing Liberal groups have declared against Hitlerism but their spokesmen enunciate policies that are as near to being Fascist as makes the difference aridly discernible. Thus the parties of the capitalist class are leering at Hitler but endeavor to hide their admiration under a cloak of mock condemnation.

When we turn to the working class movement we find a strange scene of confusion. All the parties are against Fascism; all are apprehensive as to the nearness of the monster; all have talked and demonstrated against German Fascism but all are entangled in a net of confusion when it comes to the question of how to defeat Fascism, of how to destroy the reptile before it releases its deadly sting. In this connection all are agreed

Will the British Workers Learn from the German Experience

upon the necessity for a united front. But when we come to the question of just what is meant by a united front we find a variety of views. Some of the British labour movement have made it the despair of its comrades in other lands.

Thus when the Communist party approached the Labour party, Trades Unions, Cooperatives and the Independent Labour Party for a united front against Fascism they singled out not the most important issues around which unity must be built but presented these organizations with a complete industrial and political platform embracing everything from the Versailles Treaty to the legal rights of the trade unions. The Labour party and the Trade Unions replied by stating that while they were against Fascist dictatorship they were also against Communist dictatorship and whilst they agreed upon the necessity for a united front they could not join with the Communists but would call upon the workers to join the Labour party to show the world the peaceful path to Socialism.

But this position did not suit the intelligentsia of the Labour party now comprising the Socialist League, a recently formed group of Fabians, ex-members of the I. L. P. and including J. T. Murphy, Colonel Malone, Raymond Postgate, C. D. H. Cole, and Sir Stafford Cripps. They also would have nothing to do with the Communist party but they thought that the question of Fascism raised the other question of the policy of the Labour party. In the course of their speeches and writings they succeeded in formulating a brand new program.

They declare that the Labour party must request the king to create a majority of Labour peers in order to abolish the reactionary House of Lords. Then an emergency Powers Act would be passed with the consent of the king. Parliament would be dissolved and a country would then be ruled by a series of Orders in Council which

would be operated by a body of National and District councillors appointed by the Labour cabinet and would also empower the armed forces and the police to deal with the Fascists pending the socialization of the banks, mines and railways, etc.

This wonderful scheme, in which the monarchy would cooperate in the establishment of Socialism, was immediately seized upon by the leaders of the Conservative party who labelled it "Fascist" and much to the disgust of Lansbury, Clynes and Henderson, the Labour party was accused of secretly planning a dictatorship. The executive of the party and the General secretary of the trade unions have, of course, denounced the scheme and have even hinted that they may deal with the members of the Socialist League as they previously dealt with the Communists, i. e., by throwing them out of the Labour party. In reply, the Socialist League have been at great pains to point out that they only wish to deal with Fascism in a Constitutional manner and that they are just as much against dictatorship as is Lansbury and in the course of the controversy they arrive at the remarkable conclusion that German Fascism is no dictatorship.

Thus the editor of their monthly organ, the Socialist Review, writes: "The Nazi regime is no dictatorship. Hitler and his bootleggers were every one of them elected to do just what they are doing—bait the Jews and suppress the Communists." The fact of the matter is that the Labour party is saturated with love for the constitution and both the Rights and the "Lefts" would seek to destroy Fascism by lawyers' tricks.

The Communist party has no illusions as to the constitution and even the leaders of the Independent Labour Party are becoming somewhat clear on this point but, nevertheless, all is not well with the anti-Fascist united front of these two bodies. Beginning on the basis of no criticism it was not long before the leaders were busily engaged in attacking each other. And when Fenner Brockway accused the Third International of having betrayed the interests of the working class movement, Pollitt replied by calling Brockway a counter-revolutionary. And declaring him to be "worse than any Trotskyist" he urged the rank and file of the I. L. P. to deal with its leaders. In the midst of this word war-

fare a section of the united front broke down. The Lancashire, Wales, North Eastern branches of the I. L. P. refused to continue the united front and make an appeal to the National Council which proved ineffective. The latter body met in conference and after three days' labor produced yet another policy for the I. L. P. But in the course of the debates on this policy a split took place over the question of continuing the united front with the Communist party. John Paton, general secretary of the I. L. P. resigned and five members of the National Council voted against the new policy which was only carried by a majority of four votes.

Thus the I. L. P. looks like losing yet another portion of its already greatly reduced membership. While one section stagers back to the Labour party and a few members go over to the Communist party, the main section will hold on to their precarious role of centrism, swinging between right and left. The latter wing of the party is being led by Maxton and Brockway who are endeavoring to stem off the evil day of complete disintegration. They are now supporting the world congress of all revolutionary working class organizations to be held in Paris. They do not favor a criticism of the policies of the Second and Third Internationals but desire a discussion on "positive revolutionary principles". At the same time they leave the door open for an entry into the Stalin stronghold by declaring that "the German Communist party held correct revolutionary principles but applied them wrongly", while "the cooperation of the I. L. P. and the C. P. is beginning to unify revolutionary activity that may well facilitate the creation of a united revolutionary movement."

Both the I.L.P. and the C.P. are at low ebb and it well known that wires are being pulled in order to push on the formation of a United Communist Party in Great Britain composed of a fusion of the two forces. Such a move would give a temporary lease of life to the bankrupt Stalinists as well as to the I. L. P. reformists but soon the contradictions of the Stalin line would bring the shaky structure down again.

The danger of Fascism has brought to the forefront the basic problems confronting the British working class movement and the brief experience of the united front movement of the I. L. P. and the C. P. has once again proved that there are no short cuts to success. At the same time it has revealed the Communist possibilities lying latent in the application of the united front if based on sound principles. Neither the I. L. P. nor the C. P. possess these essential qualities—hence the failure to take advantage of the weakness of the discredited Labour party.

—T. C.
August 14, 1933.

THE MILITANT
Entered as a second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879. Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition)
EDITORIAL BOARD
Martin Abern James P. Cannon
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
Arne Swaback
Vol. VI, No. 41 (Whole No. 188)
Saturday, September 2, 1933
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year
Foreign \$2.50 5 cents per copy

If the number on your wrapper is 188
renew your subscription at once: \$2 per year for fifty two weekly issues; \$1 a half year for twenty six weekly issues.

THE MILITANT
126 East 16th St. N. Y. C.

Subscribe to THE MILITANT—
One Year \$2.00; six Months—\$1.00
—On Club Plan (Clubs of Four)
Six Months 50 Cents.

the support of grain prices, in 1932 there were provided 67 millions, now 125, nearly double the amount. The "Dresdner Bank" receives 100 millions. The expenditures for military purposes were raised from 636 to 670, and including the special department of Herr Goering, Aviation, to 745 millions, that is, an increase of over 100 millions. On top of that must be added the concealed expenditures of the budget (which is free from any kind of control, and the tax relief for capital ownership, already mentioned.

The secret of spending more money and yet saving expenses is easily solved. They took away from the poorest, in order to be able to give to the richest. The war cripples and war orphans receive, instead of 1313 millions, only 1040 millions, that is, 25 percent less. The expenditures for the unemployed are reduced from 945 to 520 millions, that is, cut down by almost half. That a "balance" in the budget should be established, at least in the theory of the budget estimate, is a miracle. But this miracle is not brought about by any magical power of Hitler's, but through the starvation of the disinherited and the hell of the concentration camps.

—UNSER WORT.

Disarmament and War - V. I. Lenin

(This article was published by comrade Lenin in October 1916, in the Social-Democrat, the Bolshevik publication issued in Geneva, Switzerland during the war. It is of especial importance now, when preparations are being made for an Anti-War Congress with the participation of Barbusse and other pacifists. It clearly states the revolutionary line in the struggle against war, and distinguishes it from petty-bourgeois pacifism. To read this document now enables one to measure the distance which separates the line of Lenin and that of Stalin, the "greatest disciple of Lenin".—Ed.)

One of the main arguments in favor of disarmament is that, and it is not always directly expressed: We are against war, in general against any war, and the most definite, clear and unequivocal expression of this view ours is the demand for disarmament.

We have dealt with the incorrectness of this argument in an article on the Junius pamphlet, to which we refer the reader. Socialists cannot be against every war, without ceasing to be socialists. One must not let himself be blinded by the present imperialist war. For the imperialist epoch, just such wars among the great powers are typical, but democratic wars and insurrections too, are absolutely not impossible, such as for instance wars of oppressed nations against their oppressors, for their liberation from oppression. Civil wars between proletariat and bourgeoisie, for socialism, are inevitable. Wars between victorious Socialism in one country against other countries, bourgeois or reactionary are possible.

Disarmament is the ideal of Socialism. In Socialist society there will be no wars, consequently disarmament will be realized. But he is not a Socialist, who expects the realization of Socialism without the social revolution and the dictatorship, which supports itself, immediately upon force. Force in the twentieth century—as in the epoch of civilization in general—is neither the fist nor the club, but the army. To take disarmament into our program would mean to say: We are against the use of arms. In that there is to be found just as little Marxism as if we were to say We are against the use of force!

We want to point out that the

Imperialist War and Class War are Sharply Contrasted

International discussion on this question has been carried out mainly, if not exclusively, in the German language. And in German, two words are used, the distinction between which is hard to reproduce in Russian. One is (Abruestung) "disarmament", and is used, for instance, by Kautsky and the Kautskians in the sense of limitation of armaments. The other is (Entwaffnung) "total disarmament", and is mainly used by the Leftists in the sense of abolition of every militarist (warlike) system. We are speaking in this article of the second demand, which is prevalent among some revolutionary Social-Democrats.

II.
An oppressed class, which does not endeavor to learn how to use arms and to possess arms, would only deserve to be treated like slaves. Without becoming bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, we must not let ourselves be misled by the present imperialist war. For the imperialist epoch, just such wars among the great powers are typical, but democratic wars and insurrections too, are absolutely not impossible, such as for instance wars of oppressed nations against their oppressors, for their liberation from oppression. Civil wars between proletariat and bourgeoisie, for socialism, are inevitable. Wars between victorious Socialism in one country against other countries, bourgeois or reactionary are possible.

In every class society—whether based on slavery, serfdom or, as at present, on wage labor—the oppressing class is also armed. Not only the present standing army, but also the present militia—even in the most democratic bourgeois republics such as Switzerland is there arming of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. This is such an elementary truth that it is scarcely necessary to spend much time on it here. It suffices to point to the use of the army (including the republican-democratic militia) against strikers, a phenomenon which is the same in all capitalist countries without exception. The arming of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat is one of the most important, most fundamental, and most significant facts of capitalist society in the present period.

And in the face of such a fact it is proposed that the revolutionary social-democrats set up the demand for total disarmament! That means the same as the complete rejection of the standpoint of the class struggle, the rejection of every

thought of revolution. Our slogan must be: Arm the proletariat, to conquer the bourgeoisie, to expatriate and to disarm it. This is the only possible tactic for the revolutionary class, a tactic which arises out of the whole objective development of capitalist militarism and is prescribed by this development. Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie, can it throw all weapons onto the ash-pile, without being disloyal to its world-historical task; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only then, and in no case before.

If the present war produces fear among the reactionaries, the Christian-socialists and the weepy petty-bourgeois, only horror and fear, only aversion to any use of weapons, to blood, death, etc., then we must say: Capitalist society is and always was terror without an end. And if the present war, the most reactionary of all the wars of this society, is preparing an occasion for terror, then we have no occasion to fall into despair. In its objective meaning the "demand" for disarmament—or, more correctly, the dream of disarmament at a time when before the eyes of the whole world, through the forces of the bourgeoisie itself, the only legitimate and revolutionary war, that is the civil war against the imperialist bourgeoisie, is being prepared, is nothing but an expression of just such despair.

If anyone says that this is a visionary theory, we want to remind him of two world-historical facts: the role of the trusts and of factory work for women on the one hand, the Commune of 1871 and the December insurrection of 1905 in Russia on the other.

It is the bourgeoisie's affair to develop trusts, to drive children and women into the factory, to ruin and skin them alive there, and condemn them to the worst misery. We do not "demand" such a development. We do not "support it", but we struggle against it. But how do we struggle? We know that trusts and factory work for women are a progressive step. We do not want to go backward, to handwork, to capitalism without monopoly, to home-work for women. Forward through trusts and the proletariat, and over them, to Socialism!

These considerations, which take into account the objective course of the development, can be applied with suitable changes to the present militarization of the people. Today the imperialist bourgeoisie is militarizing not only the whole people, but the youth too. Tomorrow perhaps it will go on to the militarization of women too. To this we can only say: So much the better! So much the faster it is going ahead! And the faster it goes ahead, the nearer we are to the armed insurrection against capitalism! How can the social-democrats let themselves be intimidated by the militarization of the youth, if they have not forgotten the example of the Commune? This is no "visionary theory", no dream, but a fact. And it would be very bad in fact if the social-democrats, in spite of all economic and political facts, were to begin to doubt that the imperialist epoch and the imperialist war must inevitably lead to a repetition of such facts.

A bourgeois witness of the Commune wrote the following in an English newspaper in May, 1871: "If the French nation consisted only of women, what a terrible nation it would be!" Women and children over 13 fought at the time of the Commune alongside the men. It cannot be otherwise in the future battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. The proletarian women will not stand by passively and see how the well-armed bourgeoisie shoot down the poorly-armed or unarmed workers. As was the case in 1871, they will take up the arms, and out of the present intimidated nations—or more correctly, out of the present workers' movement, which has been disorganized by the opportunists more than by the governments—there will develop, sooner or later, but with absolute certainty, an international union of the "terrible nations" of the revolutionary proletariat.

Now militarization embraces all of public life. Imperialism is a bitter struggle of the great powers for the division and redivision of the world, and therefore it must lead to further militarization in all countries, even in the neutral and the small nations. But what will the proletarian women do about it? Will they only curse at every war and every phase of militarism and only demand disarmament? Never will the women of an oppressed class, which is truly revolutionary, content themselves with such a miserable role. They will say to their sons:

"Soon you will be grown up. They will give you weapons. Take them and learn the craft of war. This knowledge is necessary for the proletariat—not in order to shoot at your brothers the workers of other countries, as happens in this war and as the betrayers of socialism are advising you to do—but in order to fight against the bourgeoisie of your own country, to poverty and to wars, not with pious wishes, but through victory over the bourgeoisie and through their disarming."

If anyone reflects in connection with the present war, he would do better not to use big words about international social-democracy, about the struggle against war.

(To be continued.)
—V. I. LENIN.

N.R.A. and Changing Forms Of Amer. Capitalist Economy

The launching of the NRA has brought out in bold relief the intellectual sterility of Stalinism in America. When we examine the columns of the Daily Worker, we find the usual blatant generalities. One looks in vain for a sober, scientific analysis of the issue, with a view to the establishment of a correct perspective for action on the part of the working class.

The most important feature of the N. R. A. lies in the fact that the new Roosevelt turn signifies the initial stage of an entirely new political and economic organizational form for American capitalism. It is the beginning of state capitalism—the final economic form of capitalist society. How soon a more advanced stage of state capitalism is reached will depend upon the juxtaposition of a number of political and economic factors.

It is altogether inadequate to call the N. R. A. "the Slavery Act" and let it go at that, as if capitalism in any of its forms is not capital for the workers. To refuse to recognize this new turn, first, by clear-cut analysis and second, by the posing of new slogans and tactics is to continue the "tail end" position that the Stalinists have always followed with unvarying consistency. Despite the recent notable increase in strike activity throughout the country, the overwhelming numbers of the American working class along with the petty bourgeoisie is still convinced that the Roosevelt program actually means the "re-employment of men and dollars."

The present administration is very skillful and effective in the use of demagoguery. When will the disillusion come? Not until it has soaked thoroughly into the consciousness of the workers by their own experiences in the actual results and meaning of the N. R. A.

Under these conditions it is absurd to launch general appeals to fight the N. R. A. as a "slavery act" on a united front basis. These appeals will bring nothing concretely, but will weaken the possibilities for genuine united front action will become of utmost importance. The labor lieutenants, on whom the NRA relies to a considerable extent to successfully put it over, have in the meantime stimulated themselves into such activity as they have not seen in years. The labor provisions of the Act were specially designed to enlist the support of organized labor. Aside from the nullification arising out of bitter opposition by the big open shop industrialists, the law specifically and in so many words gives labor the right to organize and bargain collectively. The reason for this paradox lies in the realization on the part of the Administration that a threat was necessary in order to whip into line the recalcitrant industrialists.

The years of depression have created havoc in the labor organizations. More than one of the old line unions have seen their membership decline and disappear. The fakers have been a bit apprehensive about their pie card and felt that something ought to be done about it. The NRA gives them the opportunity and they are seizing it with both hands.

A recent bulletin brings us the news, for instance, that in Akron, Ohio, 1,500 workers have joined the A. F. of L.'s United Federal Union of Rubber Workers while 2,000 have joined the steel union in the Youngstown district. When one considers that these two basic industries have been traditionally open shop, the news achieves real significance. This bit of news can be multiplied hundredfold for the country as a whole. Everywhere the A. F. of L. is busy organizing. Johnson's declaration that no police machinery will be set up to ferret out and prosecute code violations plays right into the hands of the A. F. of L. leaders. The tasks of organized labor under the NRA will be "simplified" for the time being to the extent that it engages in policing the industries.

What is the Left wing under the TUUL doing? It is reviving its social insurance bill as a main proposition to put before the American workers! Even if the "Communist" social insurance bill were more Left than that offered by the socialists, which it is not, the T. U. U. L. would still be widely dodging the main issue.

The reaction of the Left wing to the necessities of the moment must be immediate. The tasks before it are clear. Every effort must be made to get back into the conservative unions at once. Where Left wing unions already exist constituting a factor in the industry for which they are organized, they must be extended by well planned and executed organization drives.

It is safe to predict that the time in which organization efforts will be tolerated will be short. Therefore, every possible advantage that the workers can squeeze out of the situation must be utilized. Swift action will count a great deal.

Will the N. R. A. give us shorter hours and a minimum wage scale? Very well, then, we shall organize to see to it that we get no less than that which is granted to us. We shall fight to prevent the minimum wage scales from becoming the rule. We shall fight to retain present wage scales in a number of industries from being lowered to the minimum set by the codes and for wage increases to meet increased cost of living. Such should be the tenor of our argument.

(Continued on Page 4)