

THE MARGATE AND BRIGHTON CONGRESSES

By HARRY POLLITT.

THE Trades Union Congress which was held at Margate in September, and the Labour Party Conference held at Brighton in the first week of October, can be said to have conducted their deliberations in a "threshold of war" situation, and the President of the Trades Union Congress was correct when he stated in his opening remarks, "Congress meets once more under the shadow of war."

These were the last annual conferences of the most important mass organisations of the British workers to be held before the General Election. But the main aim that both these conferences should have had in mind — that of preparing and organising the defeat of the National Government at the election and the return of a Labour Government — was completely lost sight of. Those who spoke at the conference were occupied by the Abyssinian situation practically to the exclusion of all else. And it was not seen that the carrying out of a correct policy in the defence of Abyssinia and the preservation of the peace of the world requires that it be allied with the fight to achieve the workers' demands against the employers and the National Government, and could have become the basis FOR DEVELOPING A POWERFUL MASS MOVEMENT AGAINST THE LINE OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AS A WHOLE.

In neither of these conferences did this character of the workers' struggle receive any attention. The consequence was that whilst there was undoubtedly anti-war feeling in both conferences, many delegates were profoundly disquieted at the thought that their leaders were putting forward a policy in regard to Abyssinia that completely tied up the Labour Movement behind the National Government. And these fears were not unfounded. Let us call to mind the active participation of the Labour leaders in the May Jubilee celebration of the accession of King George, a celebration which was part of the National Government's political preparations for war, and through which it succeeded to a very considerable extent in improving its political position throughout the country.

Also the fact that the *Daily Herald* day after day gave fulsome praise of the National Government's policy at Geneva, strengthening the general illusion that the National Government desired to create of itself as the defender of peace and the obstacle to Italian fascist aggression in Abyssinia. Many examples could be given from the line of the *Daily Herald* and from speeches of Labour leaders in connection with this. Perhaps the best

to support the point we are making — and it is in no way an isolated instance — is the editorial from the *Daily Herald* of September 12th, headed "The Voice of Britain," which dealt specifically with Sir Samuel Hoare's Geneva speech:

"Irrespective of Party, irrespective of domestic conflicts, the overwhelming majority of the Nation is firmly behind the Government in the stand it has now taken on this issue."

This editorial did not vary from the line that ran through the speech of the President of the Trades Union Congress in dealing with the Abyssinian situation, or in the opening and concluding remarks of Sir Walter Citrine, the Secretary of the Trades Union Congress, for in neither of these speeches could one word be found criticising the National Government or ascribing to it the responsibility for the present international situation; no attempt was made to show how it has acted as a pacemaker for war, especially in its line of collaboration with Hitler Germany and the signing of the German Naval Agreement. Both speeches gave a lead for the complete identification of the Trade Union movement with National Government policy, no differentiation was made, no independent plans outlined; the line was imperialist and not the slightest indication was given of the active policy THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT COULD PURSUE in the fight to preserve the peace of the world.

The main point of the declaration on Abyssinia that the Margate Trades Union Congress adopted reads as follows:

"United and determined in its opposition to the policy of imperialist aggression, this Congress calls upon the British Government in co-operation with other nations represented at the Council and Assembly of the League to use all the necessary measures provided by the Covenant to prevent Italy's unjust and rapacious attack upon the territory of a fellow member of the League. The Congress pledges its full support of any action consistent with the principles and statutes of the League to restrain the Italian Government and to uphold the authority of the League in enforcing peace." (Trade Union Congress, 67th Annual Report, page 346.)

Readers, in carefully noting the Congress declaration will not be slow in observing the following: there is not a single suggestion of working-class action that could be carried out by engineers, railwaymen, dockers and seamen; no proposals are made for international working-class action; no suggestions are there that the two Trade Union Internationals should be brought together in a joint united international Trade Union campaign in which the whole forces of the organised Trade Unionists of the world could be mobilised to pre-

serve peace. Every word in this declaration is directed towards bringing the Labour Movement behind the policy of the National Government and all that its policy represents at the present time.

It is also necessary to draw particular attention to the last paragraph of the declaration. Instead of clearly defining where the Trades Union Congress stood on the vital question of the independence of the colonial countries, it simply falls behind all the current imperialist propaganda that is now being served up to help in the defeat of the colonial masses, which says in effect that the imperialist robbers are anxious by "amicable means" to arrive at a more equitable distribution of the available resources of the world. This declaration, and especially Mr. Bevin's speech, opens out a perspective of a kind of round table conference, where there will be carved up and parcelled out by the Big Powers the raw materials and resources of colonial countries without any suggestion or regard to the desires of the peoples of these countries. It is a suggestion with which the working-class movement has absolutely nothing in common, and the negation of everything associated with the struggle against imperialism.

The policy of the General Council, as expounded by Sir Walter Citrine, did not go through without challenge. The Left wing delegates brought out many important points and criticisms and made practical proposals which, whilst receiving good support from the delegates, were defeated by the operation of the bloc vote.

After much discussion the Declaration was adopted: 2,962,000 voted for, 177,000 voted against.

* * *

It is important to note during the debates at the Trade Union Congress and the Brighton Labour Party Conference, the extent to which the hatred of fascism was revealed, especially on the part of the Trade Unionists.

Trade Union speaker after speaker mounted the rostrum, both at Margate and at Brighton, and in passionate tones denounced the destruction of the Trade Union movement of Germany and the murder of Trade Union leaders.

We have to note the existence of this deep feeling and more seriously endeavour to organise it in a positive anti-fascist direction. Unless this is done it can be diverted to serve the imperialist aims of the National Government, a danger against which the Communist Party is continually fighting, and not without effect, as subsequent developments within the Labour movement have shown.

The Margate decision on Sanctions aroused a tremendous controversy throughout the working-class movement, and the divergence of views

became clearer by the time the Labour Party Conference opened in Brighton. It has been interesting to observe the differences in the speeches of certain Labour leaders such as Mr. Morrison and Mr. Greenwood as compared with those of Citrine and Bevin in the intervening period between Margate and Brighton. The disquiet that was manifesting itself amongst the organised workers at the fear of being tied behind the National Government, compelled a certain change in the speeches of these leaders. Criticism of the National Government crept in, and Mr. Morrison in particular began to develop more and more the point of utilising the present situation as a medium for developing the struggle for the return of a Labour Government at the coming General Election.

We can say that the effect of the propaganda of the line of the Communist Party in the columns of the *Daily Worker*, the mass sales of our pamphlets, and at the meetings that the Party organised, succeeded in arousing the mass pressure which had its effect upon the Labour Party. The masses will never forget what this National Government has meant to them, how it has worsened their conditions, imposed the Means Test on them, brought into operation the new Unemployment Act, made big cuts in their wages, led the armaments race, developed its pro-Hitler policy. The workers hate and distrust the National Government. That is why they are fearful about supporting any policy that seems in the slightest way to indicate support for the National Government, and whilst their anti-fascist feeling is clearly reflected in the huge vote that has been given for sanctions against the war of Italian fascism in Abyssinia, it would be the most profound political error to suppose that those who were voting in this manner were in any way identifying themselves with any aspect of National Government policy either at home or abroad.

The debate at the Margate Trades Union Congress brought home to the Communist Party the imperative necessity of doing everything possible to get its line thoroughly understood amongst the mass of the workers in order that influence might be brought to bear upon the Labour Party Conference which was to meet four weeks after the Trades Union Congress and to ensure that a clearer class line could be adopted at Brighton.

The Communist Party pointed out that the National Government is an imperialist Government taking a line in regard to Abyssinia that is taken only because vital British imperialist interests are at stake; that the National Government — because of its interests in the Sudan, Egypt, India — opposes the aggressive policy of Mussolini in regard to Abyssinia because it would, if he was

allowed to carry it through, be a menace to the vital interests of British imperialism; that the attitude of the National Government in the League of Nations as outlined in Sir Samuel Hoare's speech, is absolutely different from the attitude it took when Japan was doing the same thing in Manchuria that Italian Fascism wants to do in Abyssinia. (Even while Hoare was mouthing protestations of peace, British bombing planes were murdering the peoples on the North-West frontier of India.)

The Communist Party declared that the resistance of the people of Abyssinia to Italian Fascism is absolutely justified, and its character is that of a war of liberation, in which it is the duty of the peoples of the world who hate and fear the advance of fascism and war to give them every assistance.

The Communist Party has explained that it was insufficiently realised that combined working-class direct action for the preservation of peace and bringing about unity of all forms of action and resistance against Mussolini would result in two very important political facts:

1. The strengthening of the people of Abyssinia and the colonial peoples all over the world in the fight against imperialism, and—

2. The strengthening of the fight against fascism in Italy and Germany, BECAUSE OF THE KNOWLEDGE THE PEOPLES OF THESE TWO COUNTRIES WILL HAVE OF THE MEASURES THE REST OF THE WORLD IS WILLING TO TAKE TO PREVENT THE ADVANCE OF FASCISM.

We can only successfully carry through such a line when it is accompanied by the most ruthless exposure of the policy of our own Government. Therefore, the Communist Party advanced in this situation the following demands:

1. Stoppage of all war materials to Italy and refusal to load or unload any Italian ships at present in British ports.

2. No loans to Italy.

3. Removal of the ban on export of arms to the Abyssinian people in order that they can adequately defend themselves against imperialist aggression.

4. Closing Suez Canal to all Italian transport.

5. Raising funds to assist the anti-fascists in Italy itself.

6. Demand for the surrender of all British mandates and British imperialist interests in Abyssinia.

7. The British Council of Labour to convene an emergency International conference of all working-class organisations to mobilise world-wide support to defend the independence of Abyssinia.

8. Immediate organisation of a nation-wide campaign of meetings, demonstrations, mass deputations to the Italian Embassy and Consulates throughout Britain, demanding the withdrawal of all Italian armed forces from Abyssinian territory.

9. Mass distribution of leaflets, especially among the workers in war and transport industries and among the armed forces, calling for solidarity with the Abyssinian people.

10. Election of Workers' Control Commission in the war industries to supervise all war material contracts.

11. Support for the policy of sanctions as a means

of preventing Italian fascists going to war against the Abyssinian people, and redoubled efforts to organise the defeat of the National Government and secure the return of a Labour Government on the basis of united struggle for the preservation of peace, the defence of democracy, and the improvement of the conditions of the workers.

We did not set our main task of organising energetic action by the working class on an international scale, and of stopping the production and transport of arms for Italy, etc., against the subordinate slogans demanding that the government and the League of Nations adopt collective economic and financial sanctions against Italian fascism, in defence of the Abyssinian people. The viewpoint of the Communists on this question is absolutely clear. "It is true that imperialist war is the product of capitalism, that only the overthrow of capitalism will put an end to all wars, but it is also true that by their militant actions, the toiling masses can prevent imperialist war" (Dimitrov). Basing themselves upon the peace policy of the Soviet Union, and developing independent action against imperialist war on the basis of the united front, the working class can draw all toilers and entire peoples into the struggle against the fascist instigators of war. In this connection, pacts for the maintenance of peace, the statutes of the League of Nations, and non-aggression pacts, are all factors postponing war. But the guarantee of the complete abolition of imperialist wars is provided by proletarian revolution alone and by the abolition of the prime cause of all wars—capitalism.

In the debate on Sanctions at the Brighton Conference of the Labour Party a similar resolution was adopted to that adopted at the Trade Union Congress at Margate. And in this resolution nothing is said about the independent struggle of the working class against the Italian war on Abyssinia. At the Labour Party Conference, however, the lines of the fight became sharper in the sense that the Conference manifested three distinct tendencies on this issue. The line of the Executive Committee of the Labour Party which was for Sanctions without any criticism of National Government policy, or any advocacy of separate class action by the workers was along exactly the same lines as the Trades Union Congress. (In point of fact, the Executive Committee refused to allow a declaration against the imperialist aims of the National Government to be introduced.)

Then there was the purely pacifist point of view expounded by George Lansbury, Dr. Salter and Lord Ponsonby, and the line of the Socialist League as outlined by Sir Stafford Cripps and William Mellor. In connection with the latter point of view it needs to be said that the representatives of the Socialist League were revealed as

being completely isolated from the feelings of the mass of the delegates who attended this conference.

The line of the Socialist League was a negative line. The representatives of the Socialist League asserted that nothing could be done to defend the Abyssinian people, that the English working class have nothing left to do but to sit at home and study the causes of the war which is leading to the enslavement of the Abyssinian people. This position not only amounts to complete passivity, but affords tremendous practical support to the National Government. What is fundamentally the same position but with the addition of a campaign of calumny against the Comintern, has been adopted by the Independent Labour Party. Behind a veil of revolutionary phrases, the leaders of both these organisations are actually helping the war aggressors and the policy of the National Government which is directed against the U.S.S.R. Sir Stafford Cripps, for example, tells his audience at the Brighton Labour Party Conference that he has now "changed his mind about the League of Nations" and recognises now that it is an "international burglars' union," forgetting the existence of the Soviet Union, whose rôle inside the League of Nations has been one that has filled with gratitude all who strive for peace all over the world. This deliberate omission of the rôle of the Soviet Union in the League of Nations is not accidental either on the part of the Socialist League or of the Independent Labour Party. Cripps was for the League of Nations when the Soviet Union was outside the League; he is against the League when the Soviet Union is a member of it. Fortunately for the British working-class movement, such organisations, with no mass connections, or mass influence, or record of mass struggles in any part of the country, are of very little significance at the present time.

In this critically urgent situation the Communist Party of Great Britain issued a letter to the Labour Party proposing that the Labour Party should take the initiative in calling a conference of the Second and Communist Internationals for the purpose of framing a common policy of joint international action to defend the independence of Abyssinia.

Then came the appeal of Comrade Dimitrov on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Communist International proposing an immediate conference between the two Internationals, in which he said:

"The common action of the two internationals would mobilise the working-class and would secure the support of the forces of peace among other classes of the population. It would draw whole peoples into the fight for peace. It would call forth an international movement against war of such a power that the League of Nations, under its pressure, would be compelled to undertake really effective action against the aggression of Italian fascism and German fascism. It is not yet too

late to prevent the terrible catastrophe into which the fascist criminals want to hurl mankind. To-morrow this may no longer be possible."

On the eve of their National Conference the Labour Party replied to the C.P.G.B. and declared that in their opinion no useful purpose would be served by such a conference as that proposed. The torn and mutilated bodies of thousands of Abyssinian people bear witness to part of the price that has been paid for this criminal refusal to lift a finger to bring together in a united movement the organised forces of the workers of the whole world.

While the Labour Party Conference was in session, Italy commenced its bloody war in Abyssinia. Its bombing planes wiped out thousands and dropped the message on those who were still left, "Accept Italian Friendship or die." The horror that seized every decent minded citizen compelled us to make a last effort to try and get the Labour leaders to use their influence in the international labour movement to secure a suitable decision.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain instructed me to send a telegram to the Chairman of the Labour Party Conference, as well as to a number of very prominent trade union leaders, which read as follows:

"Chairman, Labour Party Conference, the Dome, Brighton. London Evening newspapers declare 'Adowa bombed, hundreds dead.' We beg you in the interests of humanity at once agree proposal Dimitrov for common action between Labour and Socialist International and Communist International stop it would draw peoples of world into fight prevent any further slaughter defenceless people of Abyssinia and would prevent any further extension terrible catastrophe into which the fascist criminals want to hurl mankind stop workers of world if organised for common action can exert power compel immediate operation sanctions against Mussolini stop Will not British Labour leaders even at this late hour bring the two Internationals together stop Only your influence now prevents this being done stop We appeal to you in all sincerity in this fateful hour of mankind that you now take initiative in achieving workers' international unity that can save the world—Harry Pollitt."

The Press reported the next day that the Executive Committee of the Labour Party had a special meeting to consider the situation, that they had passed a resolution demanding that Parliament be convened, but had refused to agree to the suggestion for common action between the two Internationals on the grounds "that it was against their declared policy."

These leaders are anxious to summon a capitalist Parliament together, but are not to do anything to bring together the powerful forces of the workers of the world.

No wonder that Comrade Dimitrov in his further appeal to the Second International writes: "Any further delay in bringing about united action in

the struggle against the war that has already begun would be fatal. Anyone who still hesitates or delays, in this grave hour, to unite all the forces of the working-class and all the toilers, and to employ all means so that Italian military action against Abyssinia should be stopped, that the war should not spread to other parts of the world and should not become the prelude to a new world slaughter, ASSUMES AN HISTORIC RESPONSIBILITY BEFORE THE WORLD PROLETARIAT" (our emphasis).

We are very conscious of our responsibility in this situation. We have not done half that the situation demands from us in trying to organise a really effective mass backing for the appeal of the Communist International. We must face this undeniable fact.

The British Labour leaders still play their rôle of sabotaging common action between the two Internationals only because the Communist Party of Great Britain has not yet succeeded in breaking through to the broad masses with its united front propaganda, and has failed to develop the mass pressure that could compel the leaders to accept proposals that now so strongly commend themselves to many sections of the Second International itself.

Our National Party Conference held on October 5th, 6th and 7th self-critically examined the causes of these weaknesses, and set itself to overcome them in the shortest possible space of time.

We undertook the task of bringing about the most effective mobilisation of the Party we have ever yet attempted. Every single member and local is being brought into action behind the campaign for the independence of Abyssinia, and the Manifesto that the Conference issued struck the note of this campaign where it stated:

"PEOPLE OF BRITAIN!"

Demand that the League of Nations applies sanctions now against Italy. Stop all fuel and war materials being sent to Italy. Stop all loans and other forms of assistance being sent to Italy. Refuse to load and unload all Italian ships, or to transport Italian Blackshirts from Britain to Italy. Close the Suez Canal now to all Italian shipping.

WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT!

You belong to a mighty Labour movement. You wield tremendous power. You can force the National Government to act at Geneva in the way that you desire. You can ensure that the British Labour movement accepts the proposals of the Communist International for an immediate conference of the two working-class Internationals to work out a common programme and campaign that can restore and preserve the peace of the world!"

Because of the war question and the discussion created by the issue of sanctions, other important issues did not receive the attention they demanded at the Trades Union Congress. Nevertheless, some important debates took place on such questions as the right of members of the Communist Party to hold official positions in the trade unions. In fact, it is worthy of note in passing that at every recent Trades Union Congress it is stated

that "Communism has been killed." Yet when the next Trades Union Congress is held, we find an increased amount of time taken up in discussing the issues that are brought forward by the policy of the Communist Party. It was on the debates initiated by our members or supporters that the most interesting discussions took place, covering such subjects as workers' democracy inside the trade unions, the united front, the movement to co-ordinate wage demands along common lines, and the fight for international trade union unity.

On all these questions the Margate Congress indicated that there is a growing movement inside the trade unions AGAINST class collaboration, which expresses itself specifically in the character of the votes and statements made during the debate on the rights of Communists within the trade unions.

In the past year, the General Council, through what is popularly known in Britain as "The Black Circular" had endeavoured to get the Trade Unions to alter their rules and constitutions so that any members of the Communist Party would be declared ineligible to hold any official position in the unions. This dictatorial attitude had been strongly resisted, and some of the most important trade unions, had already taken decisions at their Annual Conference not to operate such a policy.

When the question came to be debated, Citrine made a statement on behalf of the General Council which was virtually a climb down from their previous position in so far as this policy of discrimination affected the trade unions, but not in regard to Trades Councils.

In the course of the speeches some interesting references were made. We will quote John Bromley, Secretary of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers, Drivers and Firemen, and Will Lawther, Vice-President of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain:

"But I do say this for my Executive and my union, that our experience with our Communist members has been a singularly happy one. We have always known where they would be in a strike. That, I am proud to say, is something that I know with regard to all our members. They have been effective and very courageous, and that they have not only fought for themselves, but also for others. — John Bromley (Sec. A.S.L.E. & F.)

Mr. Lawther said:

"Let me say frankly that the miners are going to stand no interference in the democratic method of electing their officials. We say to Congress we are entitled to elect those officials that we believe are best fitted to carry out the duties of the organisation, and we regard it as absolutely tragic that at this moment when we are discussing this paragraph, members of our organisation in South Wales are in prison because of their activities."

"We have suffered far more during the last four years from our one-time friends of the Right than from what are presumed to be our enemies of the Left, and because

of that we are very much alarmed at this policy now being put forward, and we ask the Congress unanimously to reject what, after all, the General Council themselves through the General Secretary admit does not mean everything."—Will Lawther (M.F.G.B.)

The voting on the policy of the General Council on this question was as follows: for the General Council—1,869,000; against—1,427,000. This is a very significant vote, and we believe it is the result of the better methods of work inside the trade unions that have been carried out by the Communist Party, and the firm determination of the active trade unionists to do nothing that could lead to splitting the forces within the trade union movement.

Only the most bigoted anti-Communists any longer peddle the pernicious propaganda that the Communists are out to destroy the trade unions. The workers and many trade union leaders know only too well that the aim of the Communist Party is to strengthen the trade unions, and make them fighting class organs of millions of working men and women.

The Margate Congress took important decisions on the miners' fight for increased wages, but it took no action to try and unite the wage demands that are being put forward by the miners, engineers and railwaymen. This grave weakness is the result of the deep sectionalism that prevails in the trade union movement in Britain, and in spite of the lead given by Mr. Conley, the then President of the Trades Union Congress, at the Trades Union Congress in 1934 for common action in wage questions, nothing of a practical character has been done to unite the forces of the trade unions in a common movement to secure their demands.

Neither was it seen at Margate or Brighton that if the whole resources of the Labour movement were now seriously bent on organising a united campaign to secure increased wages for the miners, railwaymen, engineers, and extra winter relief for the unemployed, such a forceful mass movement could be developed, that as we pressed forward our fight for the independence of Abyssinia and against the imperialist aims of the National Government, we could bring about a political situation in this country in which the united power of the whole working class movement could decisively defeat the National Government and return a Labour Government.

This main and supreme aim of the movement was entirely missing at this vital stage, and there was no attempt to organise this fight on a common front. That is why so many delegates were rightly disquieted at the policy of their leaders, they only saw the movement being tied up behind the National Government.

But the campaign now being conducted by the

Communist Party for the fulfilment of the aim we have set out above is meeting with increasing success and will draw more and more workers into active participation.

Mention must also be made of the important telegram of fraternal greetings that was sent to the Trades Union Congress from the Central Council of the All-Russian Trade Union movement, and which received such a warm and enthusiastic welcome from the delegates. This telegram read as follows:

Sir Walter Citrine (General Secretary):

"Moscow. To the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, Margate, Kent.

The All-Union Central Committee of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R., representing 19,500,000 trade unionists, send fraternal greetings to the 67th British Trades Union Congress now being held at Margate, confident that your Congress will help forward the unification of all working-class forces throughout the world to retard the advance of fascism and war."

It was subsequently the subject of a very favourable comment by influential trade union leaders, all of whom were glad that the first step had been taken to break the ice that had for so long separated the Trade Union movements of Britain and the Soviet Union, and we believe that from this telegram it will be possible to bring about a closer understanding in the new situation that we face to-day between what are undoubtedly the most important trade union movements in the world. This, in turn, can be helpful in leading to international developments that will bring about better prospects of unification between the International Federation of Trade Unions and the Red International of Labour Unions, as well as the respective International Trade Secretariats.

The President of the Trades Union Congress at Margate paid a notable tribute to the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union, and also at Brighton one heard expressions of similar character. We will quote from the President's speech, because it is the first time that there has been such an official recognition of the rôle that the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union represents:

"When our Congress met last year, the hope was expressed that the Soviet Union would soon enter the League of Nations. The chairman stated his belief that the presence of that great working-class power in the League would strengthen every element there that is working for peace. The U.S.S.R. has now joined the League and I hope we can count it as one of the most powerful factors operating against international fascism . . .

"To preserve peace in Eastern Europe Soviet Russia and France jointly proposed an Eastern European pact of mutual assistance within the framework of the League of Nations, to include among others both Germany and Poland. Germany, however, has so far refused to join this proposed pact, though she professes to be a sincere supporter of its Western counterpart, the Locarno Pact. The Soviet Union has, therefore, pending the adequate strengthening of the League of Nations Covenant, concluded pacts of mutual assistance with France and

Czecho-Slovakia; and we can welcome these agreements as being in accordance with the statutes and the spirit of the League."

Now this kind of utterance cannot be separated from the general swing to the Left that is beginning to manifest itself throughout the Labour movement. It also strikes a blow (even if the blow is struck by those who themselves have formerly been so assiduous, in this direction) at the propaganda that there is no difference between the Workers' Dictatorship and the fascist dictatorship and that because of this, united action between the labour movement, which believes in democracy, and the Communist movement was impossible.

Experience is breaking down this dangerous type of propaganda. More and more it is being realised that unless unity in action can be achieved, then fascism and war will triumph. But once unity in action is established, as in France, then a mighty movement begins to develop that draws in its train not only every section of the working-class but large sections of the middle class. Citrine in attacking the fight for the united front at Margate did so on the grounds of the results of the Saar Plebiscite. He was very careful not to state what had been achieved in France, in Spain, in Austria, etc.

None better than the labour leaders of Britain know the ferment that has been created inside the ranks of the Second International by the successes of the united front in France and a number of other countries. They know the new sense of political values that is being created, they are

aware of the new strength of class consciousness that is being developed, and of how the workers are re-examining the entire conception of class collaboration.

Therefore, the British Labour leaders still fiercely fight against any attempt to bring about unity in action whether in Britain itself or on an international scale.

But against this line the rank-and-file are making firm moves forward. The Labour leaders believe that association with the Communist Party would lose them votes in the General Election. The rank-and-file know that the Communist Party stands for the fight to defeat the National Government and return a Labour Government that under the pressure of the masses would extend the possibilities for the fight against capitalism.

The decisions of the Margate and Brighton Conferences entirely leave out of account this main task now standing before the British working-class movement. We will permit ourselves to express the opinion that as a result of the way the Communist Party is organising to bring about the defeat of the National Government, the way it will help to return Labour candidates in places where no Communist is standing, much will be done to break down the remaining barriers to united action that still exist in Britain.

The effect that this will have on the whole international working-class movement is very great, and the Communist Party will endeavour to fulfil in the shortest space of time its grave responsibilities to the international proletariat.

NOTICE.

The Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the Editorial Board of the journal, the *Communist International*, have decided to enlarge the size of the journal and issue it as a monthly instead of a bi-monthly magazine as previously. The price of each issue will remain the same. Subscribers will have their subscriptions extended accordingly.

Now, more than ever before, it is urgent that every reader does his share to spread the journal to ever wider circles.

Editorial Board of the "Communist International."