

794



NEW AGE

No. 3

AUGUST 1939
Contents

Vol. VI

	PAGE
1. Textile Crisis Before the Working Committee	81
2. German Fascism Undermining Switzerland ...	89
3. Socialism and Left Nationalism—By B. T. Ranadive	93
4. The New Stage of Anti-Japanese War—By Chow En-Lai	98
5. Science Learns the Goose-Step—By Prof. D. D. Kosambi	103
6. "Marxism is Dead"—By Professor Brij Narayan	107
7. Through Socialist Initiative to National Unity—Editorial	

Editor :

S. V. GHATE

SINGLE COPY TWO ANNAS

SUPPORT THE "NATIONAL FRONT" BECAUSE

It is your own paper. No Socialist can do without it.

YOU must enrol at least one subscriber per month, and thus pay your contribution.

HAVE YOU paid your share to the "National Front" Fighting Fund?
If not hurry up.

"NATIONAL FRONT" MUST LIVE BECAUSE

It is the only Marxist Weekly in our Country.

Annual Subscription:

Inland Rs. 4.

Burma Rs. 5.

Foreign sh. 10 or Dollars 3.

Office :

62/E. Girgaum Road,
Bombay, 4.

SOCIALIST BOOK CLUB

FIRST PUBLICATIONS NOW AVAILABLE

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| (1) WHAT IS TO BE DONE—by V. I. Lenin | Price: 0 12 0 |
| (2) TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX—by V. I. Lenin | „ 0 8 0 |
| (3) LENIN—THE MAN—by Clara Zetkin | „ 0 10 0 |
| (4) MARX ON INDIA (Full Text). | „ 1 8 0 |

Forthcoming Publications.

- (1) Selected speeches of Saklatwala.
- (2) Indian Peasantry under British Imperialism.

N. B.—All ordinary Members of the Club will get the above publications *at half price*: Become a member and get your copy immediately.

You can become an ordinary member by payment of Re. 1/- admission fee.

For all Particulars communicate with:

The Managing Director,

SOCIALIST BOOK CLUB

5, Elgin Road, Allahabad.



THE NEW AGE

TEXTILE CRISIS BEFORE THE WORKING COMMITTEE

[We print below the Memorandum of the Bombay Girni Kamgar Union to the Congress President for being placed before the Working Committee.—*Ed.*]

WE would make no apologies for claiming the time and serious attention of the President and the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress to the situation that has arisen in the Textiles. Throughout the long history of the National Movement and the Congress, the economics of the Textiles have provided the most intense incentives to the politics of the national struggle. Time has now come again that the situation in the Textiles is raising serious economic as well as political problems affecting the nation as a whole.

Employers Plan an Offensive

The mill-owners of Ahmedabad and Bombay, who together produce half the cloth requirements of the whole of India, recently approached the Government of Bombay and their Textile Inquiry Committee with the demand that they be permitted to cut the wages of the workers and withdraw the increases that were given last year. We are not aware of the reply of the Government or of the Inquiry Committee. It is also learnt that the employers interviewed the Governor of Bombay and laid before His Excellency the same demand.

The demand to cut the workers' wages is not only confined to Bombay. It is being supported from the textile mill-owners all over India and is a concerted move of the employers, irrespective of their province or their nationality. Indian and European employers, alike, are united in this demand and it is a significant fact that just on the heels of this comes the announcement that employers all over India are meeting to take concerted measures.

The reason why the employers have formally approached Government with proposals for a wage-cut and did not proceed straight way to impose it openly on the workers, as they have been hitherto doing, is that the increased wages which the workers are getting since last year have been obtained as a result of the findings of the Inquiry Committees—that the prosperous condition of the industry justified the workers' demands for wage-increases all over the Congress Provinces and as a result of the sanctions given by the Congress Governments to these recommendations.

The Inquiry Committees were appointed on the advent of the Congress Ministries in 1937. Taking into consideration

the rising wave of strikes in the country demanding better conditions of wages and work and in fulfilment of the Congress programme of undertaking steps to ameliorate the conditions of the exploited masses, the Bombay Government appointed its committee to find out, whether wage-increase could be given. The Committee's investigations proved that the industry was enjoying almost boom conditions and had a windfall in cheap raw cotton, good cloth prices, absence of Japanese competition due to the China War and general trade recovery. The general trade recovery gave the employers normal profits while the unprecedented fall in cotton gave them extra-ordinary profits. The Committees in Bombay held that from the windfall resulting from this extra factor alone the Industry could give wage-increases lasting for full two years.

This recommendation was opposed by the employers throughout the Presidency. The threat of a general strike from the workers and the pressure of the Government assisted by the facts as found by a thorough Enquiry forced the employers to yield.

In view of this background to the wage-increases the employers, if they wanted to cut down wages again, had to approach Government—if not legal at least for moral sanction—and had to build up a case over again justifying their demand.

Real Objective—Political

The employers in justification of their proposals to cut wages and attack the working-conditions of the masses, put forward three reasons which they claim, have cropped up since the reports of the Committees. One is that a general trade depression has set in, secondly the Con-

gress Ministries, particularly the one in Bombay have imposed taxations in order to further their prohibition and other schemes, which handicap the industry in its competition against Foreign imports and thirdly the Central Government's Legislation in fulfilment of the Indo-British Trade Pact and the New Duty on Raw Cotton have raised the danger of severe competition from Lancashire. In view of these New factors, Trade Depression, Provincial and Central legislations, the employers are compelled to cut down wages and preserve the industry.

It is thus plain that the employer's grievance is not only against the anti-national acts of the British Government, but is as much against the social legislation—undertaken by the Congress Government in fulfilment of their programme and election pledges. The Bombay Government, for example, imposed a tax on the landlords of Bombay and Ahmedabad to meet costs of prohibition. The millowners of both the cities are making common cause with the landlords and liquor traders against this tax, and consequently against prohibition, and demand its removal or threaten wage-cuts. The exploiters will not allow the Congress to undertake legislative measures for the masses at the cost of their profits.

Fore-stalling Social Legislation

In the matter of provincial legislation, the employers' grievances is directed not only against measures already undertaken, but against measures that are foreshadowed and promised in the programme and principles of the Congress Governments. This is a very important aspect of the millowners' drive against further legislation. In this we may again

refer to the case of the Bombay Ministry and its Inquiry Committee. Like all Congress Ministries, Government had promised social legislation for the working-class in the matter of leave with pay, sick leave, unemployment benefit, and minimum living wage. If these were not to remain merely election promises, it was natural that a part of their costs was bound to come from the employers. While the Committee was inquiring into the possibility of wage increases, the employers asked it to take into consideration the fact that the Congress Government were pledged to impose a further burden on the industry by way of social insurance legislation and hence wanted the Committee to have the matter referred to the Government. The Government as far back as December 1937 declared that within six months or so they would be taking up schemes of sick leave and holidays with pay. The Inquiry Committee, therefore, while recommending wage-increase did not do it to the fullest extent justified, but left over sufficient margin to the employers, from the profits already accrued to them, to provide for the foreshadowed legislation. Just as the Bombay recommendations were followed in other provinces, these promises of social legislation were also copied. Therefore, so soon as the Congress Governments seriously began to take up social legislation, whether in the matter of workers or Kisans, the employers began an all-India offensive against any amelioration being given to the exploited masses at the cost of the exploiters.

It is significant to note that this campaign against social legislation long preceded the Acts of the Central Government, long before the Indo-British Trade Pact and the Cotton Duty

came into existence. It is also significant to note that the employers so far have made no proposals to raise any serious opposition to the Central Government. But they have been very vehement and aggressive against Provincial Legislation for the masses. Their first reaction to the attack of the British Government has not been one of direct opposition to the British Government, but one of opposition to the masses of the country, one of attacking the living of the masses.

This clearly points out that the employers' campaign against social legislation, against wage-increases, is not motivated by purely economic considerations, but has its political aspect also. In short, the employers all over India, especially the big vested interests, will not tolerate the strengthening of the masses at the hands of the ministries, that have come to power on the strength of the masses, and will not tolerate the organised strength of the working class to grow.

No Economic Justification

This conclusion is supported when we examine the economics of the employers' case and find that it does not vindicate their position. On the admission of their own representatives, like the Chamber of Commerce, the "new burdens" imposed on the industry amount to taking away 14% from its protective armour, of which provincial legislation and wage-increases amount to only 5%, while the balance of 9% is taken away by the Acts of the Central Government. A set of employers that were not determined to smash the working masses and the Congress Government would have first come forward with proposals to fight the major burden imposed by a foreign anti-national government.

Instead, the employers have rushed in the first instance to cut the wages of the unprotected exploited masses, to demand abrogation of the property taxes and prohibition and to compel the Government not to undertake further ameliorative measures, already promised. They would rather fight the masses and the nation for the 5% burden than fight the foreign enemy for the 9% burden. Hence we maintain that the employers all over India have an anti-national political motive behind their proposals which seem to be ostensibly mitigated by pure economic considerations.

This is further supported when we examine and find that the Trade Depression is not of the depth it is alleged to be and the provincial measures and wage-increase have not cut at the normal profits of the industry. We would again draw attention to the Report of the Bombay Committee that the wage-increases that they gave came purely from the extra profits and left the normal trading profits untouched. The employers allege that these extra profits, arising from low cotton price and a higher cloth price, have been destroyed by the fall in cloth prices, since the Committee reported, and that the cotton duty raises the price of foreign cotton; that the depression is severe is indicated by accumulating stocks. Without going into details we may point out that just when conditions were arising where the extra advantage arising from disparity between cotton and cloth prices was being diminished by the fall of the latter, the subsidy proposals of the United States Government to their Loan Cotton, pulled cotton prices still further down and to a certain extent helped to retain the former extra advantage. The accumulation of stocks is partly seasonal

and every year summer shows more or less full godown as a normal feature, unless very extra-ordinary boom conditions prevail.

It may be argued that while the extra profits and advantages have been entrenched upon by the wage-increases and provincial legislation the normal trade itself is now being hampered and ordinary profits also cut into by the 5% lowering of protection and consequent relief to Lancashire. While, we certainly condemn the Pact and the gift to foreign capital we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the crisis in England itself has forced the employers there to give concessions to British Textile workers, which in their turn restore the protection to the industry here in an indirect manner. The British Textile workers only recently secured the minimum wage-law and holidays with pay from the Government. This has forced the cotton employers there to raise weaving price by 8%. While we have not been able to gauge the full effects of this, we certainly can say that it indicates an indirect relief from the effects of the reduced protection, in that the cost of production of Lancashire cloth has risen to some extent as a result of the above social legislation. Our employers surely have not missed to read the Customs Report of the Federated Malaya States, which shows that the severe boycott of Japanese Cloth by Chinese merchants in the F. M. States has expanded the market there for Indian cloth—not for Lancashire. We may say that the picture of an industry sinking in depression is ever painted and the economics of the case do not justify wage-cuts.

The representations of the employers, though they have not received sanction

from the Government for a direct wage-out, have produced one result, which is disastrous to the masses. The determined opposition that they have given to any move of the ministries to support the demands of the masses for the last two years have successfully stopped the promised social legislation (for minimum wage, unemployment benefits and sick leave) taking any concrete shape. The employers have succeeded in ending the period of conceding relief to the masses. They have succeeded in preventing legislation for recognition of trade unions for collective bargaining, for security of services. They have dammed the rising tide of mass strength.

Having succeeded so far they are now demanding a positive offensive against the working class and not only prevent its further gains but take away the gains already achieved.

It may be asked however, that since the Government have not upheld the demands of the employers, and since the employers have not taken any steps to realise their demand independently, since the employers in Bombay or elsewhere have not declared a general cut, where is the necessity of raising a scare about it or the necessity for Congress and the Government to intervene? In answer we submit that we are not posing the issues for merely an academic argument or to meet a supposed danger. The employers are already making the cuts a reality, the employers are already partially successful in enlisting the sympathy of the Government in their endeavour and the Congress Government of this province instead of intervening on behalf of labour is falling a victim to the ideas of Law and Order against labour. The employers attack is not

merely confined to Bombay but is receiving an all-India support.

Individual Wage-cuts Begin

The employers had never taken kindly the enforcement of a wage-increase. Therefore, immediately after the sanctions of the wage-increases they took steps to reduce their wage-bill by an indirect method. The strength of workers per thousand spindles and per hundred looms was reduced and work intensified. Schemes of rationalisation were introduced which swelled the ranks of the unemployed and reduced the total income of the working class. The fact that Inquiry Committees of Government were discussing the problem of rationalisation, the problem of intensified labour and unemployment arising from rationalisation, was altogether neglected. The fact that a Committee was sitting to devise an equitable basis of wage-rates was ignored and new weaving rates were introduced, bringing about savings in the wages-bill.

In Chalisgaon when workers resisted rationalisation the Congress leadership, in spite of all our efforts at conciliation, failed to stand by the workers unequivocally and the Congress Government connived at the owners' violation of an agreement, which was reached through the mediation of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee. As a result the workers after repeated and long resistance were defeated. In Barsi, one employer most blatantly imposed a wage-cut of 20% only recently. During the course of investigation before the Inquiry Committee it was found that one employer had refused to carry out Government's recommendation of last year to give wage-increase and yet he was never exposed before public opinion, or and

Government taken any steps to denounce the fact to the public.

Emboldened by these examples, the employers in Bombay and Ahmedabad have now made proposals of wage-cuts all round. Serious preparations are afoot for a lock-out or enforce short working hours in the whole industry. It appears that in many quarters an idea is entertained that the disaster of a lock-out can be averted by permitting shorter working hours. But it is plain in the face of it that shorter hours mean shorter earnings and thus are bound to act as a disastrous wage-cut in an indirect way. In order to test the attitude of the Government, of the public and the workers, individual employers are putting out feelers, as in the case of the Phoenix Mill in Bombay where the millowner, in spite of the fact that his last year's working showed a profit of Rs. 1,38,817 locked out the mill indefinitely in April, alleging severe trade depression. Thus our calling for your immediate intervention is not based on mere scare but on concrete instances of mill owners' attacks as part of the impending general attack.

Ministry Fails the Workers

The attitude taken up by the Ministry in the case of Phoenix Mill has been most revealing to us and we wonder if it is to be taken as a new change in Government's policy towards labour. When the employer over the head of the mass of his old workers, wanted to rush in 200 men under the cloak of maintaining safety service for the machinery, the workers, especially one thousand women, resisted the attempt on the ground that before any safety service to the mill could be given, assurance of safety and security of their services must be given

by the employer. When we represented matters to the Ministry and asked for the assurance, the Home Minister maintained that Government was concerned only with maintenance of Law and Order and was bound to supply police protection when asked for by the employers; as for the security of service of 4,000 workers it was a matter to be negotiated between the employer and the workers. But what were the workers to do when in the absence of collective bargaining and trade union recognition the employer refused to negotiate? The Congress Ministry refused to intervene or answer the question.

In an unequal struggle between the exploited workers and the mighty vested interests the workers expect the Congress Ministry to unequivocally stand by them and protect their interests. But more and more we find that under the onslaught of the employers, our Ministries have not only ceased to make progress in favour of the workers but have taken to the road of assisting the employers in their struggle against the workers.

Not a Police Problem

It has, therefore, become imperative that we call the attention of the Congress organisation and ask its intervention on the side of labour. It has become imperative that our ministers cease treating workers' struggles as a problem for Law and Order Department, as a Police Problem.

There is still another reason why Congress and its Governments should intervene on the side of labour and not allow the crisis to be treated as a dispute to be settled between the employers and the employed. The textile industry here has been assisted in its growth to a

very great extent by the national movement. It was the Boycott movement that saved the industry from the ruinous effects of the last world depression, and the boycott movement was a creation of the masses and the Congress. The industry cannot be allowed to treat its affairs as one of private economic enterprise, wherein others have no right to intervene.

It has at the same time to be remembered that the industry, while utilising the national movement for its gains, has never voluntarily surrendered a part of its profits to the working masses, who had always to struggle whether it be for increases or against cuts. Therefore the interests of the working-masses must receive the first protection at the hands of the Congress and Government.

While recognising that the textile industry should be protected against the attack of foreign capital, we maintain that it must not be done at the cost of the working masses, by imposing wage-cuts, rationalisation, shorter hours or holding up ameliorative legislation. Particularly today the industry is not in such a position that it is forced to take the drastic anti-national step of a wage-cut. If it is allowed to do that, it is the surest way to drive a wedge between the Congress Ministries and Labour, to provoke labour to resistance, to provoke the Congress Home Members to attack labour, to disrupt the popular forces, and ultimately behead the national movement itself. The all-India offensive of the employers is dominated more by unpolitical considerations of the reactionary block and vested interests than by urgent and serious economic necessity. In the face of it the Congress and the Government must remain firm and not only resist the

attack on the working class but proceed unflinchingly with its schemes—social legislation for minimum living wage, sick leave, holidays with pay and Trade Union recognition. That is the road to strengthen the masses and the national struggle.

Fight the Imperialist Offensive

At the same time we urge that definite steps be taken to challenge the imperialist attack of Cotton Duty and Trade Pact. For that the most potent and powerful weapon of national boycott of foreign goods must be at once brought out of the armoury. The working class is ever ready to play its role on the railways, the docks, the markets and the whole nation, to defeat the game of Imperialism. National boycott today is enough to remove whatever handicap is imposed on the industry by the two Acts of the Central Government. That will rally the nation in a wide struggle and it will stop all talk of attack on the working masses. No wage-cuts, No short work, No rationalisation against the workingclass, but a powerful national boycott against the foreign enemy and for the national industry and for further gains to the masses and the national struggle—that we submit should be the only line for the Congress and the Congress Ministries.

We hope the President and the Working Committee will adopt this line. But if our appeal goes unheeded, if the employers' offensive continues unabated, if the Congress Ministries shelter the employers instead of helping the workers, the working class will be left with no other alternative but resist on a nation-wide scale by means of a general strike. Because of the fact that the employers were moving rapidly and

there was no near prospect of securing your intervention, we have already given the slogan of preparing for a general strike to resist wage-cuts and lock-outs. But we hope the workers will be saved this sacrifice, if the whole nation rallies at your behest in their defence and against the anti-national vested interests

and the attack of the Government.

We are enclosing for your information herewith the momentous resolution * adopted by the textile workers in Bombay City, supported by the workers of Khandesh, Cawnpore, Sholapur and other centres.

* [The Resolution refers to the determination of the Textile Workers all over the country, to launch a struggle on an All-India scale, in case their grievances go unheeded. —Ed.]

SUBSCRIBERS

SUBSCRIBERS failing to give their subscription Nos. (that are given on the wrappers) should not complain of any delay in attending to their instructions.

Manager,
NEW AGE.

GERMAN FASCISM UNDERMINING SWITZERLAND

HERR VON BIBRA was until 1935 councillor of the German embassy in Prague. Such, at least was his official title; unofficially he was Hitler's specially appointed agent for the task of "bringing the Sudeten Germans back home to the Reich." In his capacity he had nominated Henlein as the Fuehrer of the Sudeten Germans, and it was in this capacity also that his ears were soundly boxed, in 1934, on the streets of Prague by a Czech woman. Finally, Herr von Bibra was constrained to quit Prague, as the leading part he played in the organisation of treasonable activities could no longer be concealed.

Herr von Bibra moved straight from Prague to Berne. But there has since been no change in his activities. He is now first councillor of the German embassy in Berne, and the only change made in his specially appointed, unofficial, duties is the substitution of the term "Swiss Germans" for "Sudeten Germans." One might have hoped that the Swiss government would manifest more vigilance than the capitulatory government of Hodza, and would keep strict tabs on the councillor of the German embassy. However, the fate of the Czechoslovakian Republic appears not to have made any impression upon the Swiss government, and Herr von Bibra, officially and openly, and with the government's express sanction, is "Fuehrer of the German National-Socialists in Switzerland" as well as embassy councillor. Thus the range of the "unofficial" appears substantially to have

shrunk, and conditions for Herr von Bibra's sinister activities appear to be even more favourable than in Prague.

The activities of the "Fuehrer of the German National-Socialists in Switzerland" are extraordinarily varied. By means of coercion and blackmail Germans and Austrians living in Switzerland are to be forced into serving the Fascist plans of aggression. So much is generally known, and is almost official so to speak. At any rate, any attempt to stem these activities would be looked upon as violation of Swiss neutrality, not only by Herr von Bibra and his employer, Hitler, but also by the Swiss Government. As for that branch of Herr von Bibra's activities—which is concerned with Swiss citizens, organisations and newspapers—this is considered as the "unofficial" aspect of his mission.

Under pressure of public opinion—and also after certain cantons, particularly that of St. Gall, had started to proceed on their own account against the Swiss Nazi agents—the homes were searched, throughout Switzerland, of well-known members of Swiss Nazi organisations, and even some arrests were made. The public gathered from these proceedings only that sufficient damaging evidence was discovered to prove the close connection of these organisations with "foreign centres." Beyond this, the Swiss authorities were silent.

Nevertheless, a certain amount of further information filtered through. For example, not long ago *Die*

Nation, the organ of the "Richtlinien" movement, published a report from its Lucerne correspondent stating that instructions, emanating from the German authorities, had been found on German engineers employed in certain Swiss factories in which these engineers were ordered, in the event of an outbreak of war, not to return to Germany. Their task was to remain in Lucerne, and, in the event of German air attacks, to indicate the most important industrial centres of the town.

The Lucerne correspondent then continued:—

"It is said, here in Lucerne, that the result of the investigations is so damaging that the authorities do not dare to deport all these spies as there are too many of them. Diplomatic conflicts are feared, and therefore other means of getting rid of them are being sought."

This despatch from Lucerne represents only part of the truth. The German Government would certainly not rest content with giving its subordinates in Switzerland instructions only in the eventuality of an outbreak of war. Wrecking work, sabotage and espionage, even during this period of so-called peace, is going on at full speed; and practically not a single step in this direction is taken without the most specific instructions from Berlin. It is not for nothing that Herr von Bibra is "Fuehrer of German National-Socialists in Switzerland."

The Government remains silent, but at the same time is planning a diversion—an offensive against the Communists.

Indignation at the Criminal activities of German fascists in Switzerland is growing day by day, and can no longer

be allayed by fine words regarding neutrality and neighbourly relations with the fascist predatory states. Therefore the Government—with the support of the Fascist and semi-Fascist press—is seeking to divert this indignation by directing it against the Communists. An unsavoury campaign of misrepresentation is to be the pretext for the passing of anti-Communist legislation, as no grounds whatever can be found in the sincerely democratic and anti-Fascist Communist Party itself. Such methods, of course, are not new—they are the old and tried methods of repression.

The Fascist peril, the danger of "co-ordination," ("Gleichhaltung") of the partition of Switzerland among the Fascist aggressors, has become a very *present* one, particularly since Munich; and the Swiss people realises this and has sounded the alarm. It has recently been shown that neither German nor Italian Fascism can boast of any support in Switzerland to talk about—yet the process of fascisation is making definite progress! This only is possible because the forces of democratic resistance are profoundly divided and without a leader.

If any proof be needed of the above statement, the referendum of November 27, 1938, on the Finance Bill, provides it. The situation was as follows. Ever since 1933, the existence of an emergency clause—which has here fulfilled the same function as Bruening's emergency decrees did in Germany—has enabled the sponsors of all financial bill to prevent them from being the subject of a referendum as is provided in the constitution, in order to avoid their certain rejection by the people.

All working-class organisations, the Swiss trade unions and Social-Democratic

Party and the Swiss Communist Party are carrying on a powerful campaign against the policy of the emergency clause. In the course of this struggle the "Richtlinien" movement was born to which adhere all the trade unions, the Social-Democratic Party, the Young Peasants, some cantonal democratic parties, and other groups, including the young Catholic group: "Entscheidung."

All the above organisations, parties and groups unitedly demand the termination of the emergency clause policy, adequate funds for the provision of employment, the operation of the old-age pensions provisions, and the strengthening of national defence through increased taxation of capital.

The Finance Bill which was submitted to the referendum last November provided neither for increased taxation of capital, nor for the adequate provision of funds for employment, nor for putting into operation old-age pensions. Most of the revenue originally destined for these purposes was now to be allocated to national defence. The new Finance Bill also asked for a prolongation by another three years of the validity of all previous financial provisions—which were introduced by means of the emergency clause and are strongly opposed by the "Richtlinien" movement. Yet the trade unions and Social-Democratic Party asked the voters to vote "Yes"! This is the consequence, on the one hand, of certain paltry and vague concessions by the government, and, on the other, of the deliberately disruptive policy of the notorious Ilg, secretary of the metal workers' union.

This is that same Ilg who concluded an agreement with the employers in the metal industry by which the workers

renounce the right to strike. The same Ilg who wrote in his paper, the *Metallarbeiterzeitung* (the "*Metal Workers' Journal*") that one should learn "folk community from the German Fascists, and who held up the Nazi "*Kraft durch Freude*" ("*Strength through Joy*") organisation as an example both for Swiss employers and workers.

Thus it transpired that partners in the "Richtlinien" movement were in opposition to each other in the struggle for and against the Finance Bill. The Young Peasants, the federal Democrats under the leadership of Dr. Gadients (the strongest party in the Canton of Grisons) and also the Social-Democrats and trade unions of Geneva, voted "No" as against the "Yes" of the Swiss Social-Democracy and trade unions. Thus there arose a sharp antagonism here, where really no antagonism should exist; for the Swiss Social-Democratic Party also supports demands for taxation of Capital, for the modification of the wage reductions ordered by emergency clause, for the provision of work and for old-age pensions. Instead of a united struggle for these demands, there arose in part a bitter struggle among themselves. The policy of division triumphed, and German Fascism—or, as Ilg prefers to term it, German "folk community"—may boast of yet another success.

Thus the democratic forces in Switzerland present a picture of profound division which makes it comparatively easy for German Fascism to push Switzerland farther along the path of her own downfall. Nevertheless, at the same time the desire and determination to resist is also growing. Undoubtedly the Swiss people is prepared to defend with arms its country and its freedom,

even against superior forces. This applies as much to the German-speaking Swiss as to the French-speaking, to the Italian-speaking as to those speaking Roman. The insolent instructions which German Fascism issues to the Swiss, the orders from Berlin that Switzerland, in the name of "neutrality," must suppress expression of opinion and limit democratic rights, have opened the eyes of numerous Swiss citizens to the real intentions of Hitler Germany.

The immediate danger is not that of military aggression. Like Italy, Germany has every reason to fear a war that might be transformed overnight into a world war which would bring in its train the inevitable defeat of the Fascist powers. No, the greatest immediate danger for Switzerland lies in surrender to Fascism. The peril lies in the undermining and disintegration of those factors which are most essential to the successful defence of Swiss democracy. There is, of course, still time to arrest this perilous process. The will to anti-Fascist unity is strong and increases from day to day. What is lacking is its concentration and organisation. Democratic anti-fascist unity naturally cannot be achieved on the basis of inter-party co-operation all the way from Musy, over Motta, to Ilg, but only in a struggle against these agents of Fascism.

And it is upon these agents and allies that German Fascism principally relies. The *Berliner Borsenzeitung* has candidly stated that Germany believes that a decline in Swiss democracy, and the renunciation of Marxism by the Swiss working-class movement, with a turning towards National-Socialism, is imminent. In other words, German Fascism looks

upon people like Motta in the middle class and Ilg in the working class as the executors of its intentions.

There exist, in all sections of the population of Switzerland, and in all parties, tendencies and forces which are in favour of a determined struggle against the attempt to fascisize the country. At the same time, however, there also exist, in almost all organisations and parties, protagonists of capitulation, the masked or open agents of Fascism, who have so far been able to paralyse the anti-fascist forces, to intensify existing antagonisms, to provoke new divisions, and to hinder all attempts at unity.

This applies particularly to the organisations of the Swiss working class. The Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions—which, in view of their numerical strength and social composition, were pre-eminently qualified to take the lead in the process of rallying almost the entire Swiss population against Fascism—are almost completely paralysed, as a result of international antagonisms and the ruling tendency within them towards surrender and division.

The amazing and depressing spectacle may now be witnessed in Switzerland of peasant, democratic and Catholic bodies carrying on a struggle against Fascism, which is clearer and more consistent than that of the great organisations of the Swiss working class.

This deplorable weakness cannot be overcome by patching up irreconcilable antagonisms. It can be overcome only by means of a merciless struggle against the capitulators, against the agents of Fascism in the ranks of the Swiss organised working class. It will not be by the Social-Democratic Party surrendering to Ilg and his allies, but by the

forced surrender of this same Ilg and his friends to the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions, to the mass of their members and functionaries, that the way will be made clear for the defence of Swiss independence and democracy against Fascism.

The unification of all anti-Fascist forces within the great organisations of the working class, the cleansing of these organisations of hostile agents, a pitiless struggle against the capitulators and against every attempt to cripple the anti-fascist forces—such is the task upon

whose fulfilment will depend whether Switzerland is or is not to become the prey of the fascist bandits. It is only in a struggle for these ends, and in a struggle against a government which under cover of an alleged neutrality, has written complete surrender into its programme, that democratic Switzerland can be successfully defended. In an alliance with Motta, in an alliance with fascists, they cannot fight Fascism. Communist-baiting was never the beginning of a successful struggle to defend Democracy, but without exception, was every where a step towards Fascism.

SOCIALISM AND LEFT NATIONALISM

By B. T. Ranadive

THE Socialist movement in this country went through its first test when it was confronted with the rise of left-discontent, which finally crystallised itself into the Forward Bloc. The Socialists had acted as the spear-head of the Left so far. After the Tripuri Congress Left discontent has been growing by leaps and bounds and the base of the Left, so far led by the Socialists began suddenly expanding. The socialists were faced with the task of giving a clear-cut *political lead* to the whole Left, a lead that will be an effective resistance to Right disruption and yet preserve the unity of the Congress and carry the whole Congress forward towards struggle. This necessitated that the Socialists evolved a plan of joint action with the non-Socialist radicals. But the Socialists failed to speak with one voice. The result of this failure was that the Left nationalists formed

their own organisation, the Forward Bloc thus demarcating themselves from the Socialists on the one hand and isolating themselves from the mass of Congressmen on the other.

The rise of the Forward Bloc, created still further vacillation in Socialist ranks. Instead of giving a united lead to the non-Socialist lefts, the Socialist movement experienced partial split and defections. Three trends appeared in the Socialist ranks. One advocated a line of having nothing to do with the Forward Bloc. Another stood for individual socialists joining the Forward Bloc. The third trend represented by the Communists, advocated co-operation with the Bloc, without Communists and Socialists, individually joining it.

The second trend was dominant among a number of Socialists. Some even joined the Forward Bloc and left the

Congress Socialist Party. Others refrained from joining it, though not convinced about the wisdom of doing so.

This crisis in the Socialist movement, this indecisiveness at a critical juncture, forebodes ill for the future of the movement. It arose out of a fundamental failure on the part of certain Socialists to understand the basic role of the Socialist movement and its relation to the radical tendencies that may appear in the national struggle from time to time.

The rise of the Forward Bloc, posed for the first time the question—what should be the attitude, the policy of the Socialist Party towards a left-nationalist Party?

The question could only be decided on the basis of fundamentals, and further on the basis of a concrete understanding of what left-nationalism stands for.

For the Socialists, the class-approach is fundamental. It is only because the Socialists can consistently apply this approach to the national struggle that they can aspire to give a lead to the entire nation. Further the Socialists, are nothing if they are not the representatives of the working-class. Their struggle to give a lead, is in the end but a prolonged fight to establish the hegemony of the working-class in the national movement. Unification of the radical forces is only a weapon for Socialists to unite the entire people for a common and decisive struggle against British Imperialism. Left Unity can never be an end in itself; but a means to achieve the greater end—the unification of the people.

Where does left-nationalism stand today? No doubt it stands for ending the policy of drift, for greater co-ordination of struggle, for closer relations between

class-organizations and the Congress. It would seem that left-nationalism stands today with the Socialists on every vital question of the day. That is no doubt true so far as the overwhelming majority of non-socialist radicals is concerned.

But as Socialists, we can never forget that this attitude on practical questions is the result of the *initiative* of the Socialists, Communists and the Kisan Sabhaites. Long before left-nationalism found its programme, that programme was put to practical test, and popularised by the Socialists themselves. The Socialists and Communists were not content with the slogan of "closer relations." They built Kisan Sabhas, they built trade unions, organized protest-strikes and Kisan Satyagraha, and practically demonstrated that mass-allegiance could be won for a more thorough-going programme of struggle and advance. They could do so only because of their class approach, only because this approach was applied at least partially to the various problems that face the national movement. Without Socialist initiative, without this practical leadership, and without the persistent struggle of the Socialists, against the policy of drift, Left-nationalism would not have found the present radical programme that it has got.

The situation as confronts us today is, as follows:—Left-nationalism stands today as a programme popularised by the Socialist movement; yet because of the failure of the Socialists to take *Organisational Lead*, it confronts the Socialist movement as an independent force.

Taking its stand on the immediate programme popularised by the Socialists, Left-nationalism distinguishes itself by its total failure to understand the

class-approach behind the programme, and therefore its inability to consistently carry forward the programme. The Socialists see in the drift of the Right Wing, the vacillations of a class—the Indian bourgeoisie. The left-nationalists see in it the conspiracy of individuals—the High Command. The first approach leads to a patient struggle against the vacillations, hard practical work to isolate the compromising tendency combined with a merciless exposure—all to be achieved in a manner which will maintain the growing unity of the Congress as against the disruption brought about by the policy of the Right Wing. The second approach seeks short-cuts, concentrates only on the failings of the leadership, does not exert to win over the masses yet under the right-wing leadership. It really seeks to achieve the impossible. It seeks to do away with the political influence of the class without taking any effective steps to remove or lessen it. Divorced from the class-approach of the Socialists, left-nationalism, if allowed to have its own course will disgrace itself as a factional combination allying itself with opportunist elements and disgracing the radical movement as a whole. On the fundamental question of national unity, threatened by Right disruption the leader of the left-nationalism, Subhas Bose, miserably fails when he lightly talks about "Civil War" "parting of ways" and quotes the old splits to demonstrate that even splits lead to a strengthening of the Congress. Here left-nationalism merely plays the game of Right disruption and socialists can have nothing to do with it.

But this alarming tendency does not stop here. Dreams of alternative Congress are seriously entertained by a

section of left-nationalist leaders. Bose speaking at a meeting in Bombay contrasted the policy of the Forward Bloc with the policy of the Congress—posed the Bloc against the Congress and demonstrated how wild were the dreams entertained by a section of the left-leaders.

Besides, a number of opportunist alliances are already in evidence. In Nagpur on the 9th July, Dr. Khare appeared to speak on behalf of the Forward Bloc only the protest of the Socialists prevented him from addressing the meeting. In Bombay Bose made a guarded anti-prohibitionist statement, seeking sympathy from the most-dubious quarters. A number of anti-Kisan sabhaites—confirmed opponents of Mazdoors and Kisans, find a ready access to the Forward Bloc.

These are dangerous tendencies, and if allowed to go unchecked they would spell ruin and disaster not only for the left, but for the country as a whole. There are thus two distinct tendencies in the Forward Bloc. One a genuine left-tendency which seeks to go forward, takes its stand on the programme of struggle popularised by the socialists and yet unable to apply the main principles of that programme towards the problem of all-embracing national unity. It is unable to make this turn just because it lacks the class-approach of the Socialists, of the working-class. It is at present in an anti-rightist mood, because the events since the presidential election centred round certain persons. Its disillusionment with the Right did not come, directly over political issues, but issues which appeared to be personal. It is just because it lacks this class perspective, that this genuinely radical tendency stands in danger of being

exploited by persons to whom any stick is good enough to beat the Right Wing with. The danger of left-nationalism, degenerating into factionalism is, therefore, real and immediate. Instead of being a force to develop broader Unity, a force to isolate the compromisers and thus prevent disunity of the people, left-nationalism may develop into a factional counterpart of right disruption.

The Socialists, therefore, owe a definite responsibility towards the Forward Bloc. The basic left discontent behind the formation of the Bloc, is to be developed and disciplined. They must understand that the programme of the Bloc is borrowed from their own activities; and that in this respect it marks a tremendous step forward in the development of left-nationalism. They must also understand that to leave the left-elements to their own fate is to reject the task of Socialist leadership, is to reject the struggle for the hegemony of the working-class. Those who originally advocated that Socialists should not enter into an alliance with the Forward Bloc, were definitely wrong; they practically gave up their role of acting as the spearhead of the left forces. They also forget, that without Socialist alliance and leadership, left-nationalism would come to grief, and thus bring disruption to the entire Left, that it would become a weapon in the hands of factionalists, and thereby make the struggle against drift more difficult. Welcoming therefore the programme of the Forward Bloc as an advance, the Socialists cannot ignore the shortcomings of the Bloc and its followers. In the first place they cannot ignore the fact that independent Socialist practice alone could keep the left elements on the proper path. The more the Socialists

showed in actual practice how a mass-basis could be secured for a policy of advance, how in the end through the partical struggles and class-organizations a base could be created for a nationwide struggle, how concretely the Right Wing drift could be fought, the more they did this the greater would be the mobilization of non-socialist radicalse for a patient struggle against compromise, and the lesser will be the influence of the factional and opportunist-elements, on them. This meant also freedom of patient and even sharp criticism of left-nationalists whenever they chose the wrong path and freedom to follow one's own path and demonstrate the demarkating line between left-uationalism and Socialism. Without such a demarcation, without such criticism, left-nationalism cannot be made to keep up to its radical politics.

Those who advocated that individua Socialists should join the Forward Bloc, only behaved as ordinary radicals. They forgot the necessity of Socialist leadership based on a correct class-approach. Enchanted by the programme of the Forward Bloc, indignant at the disgusting tactics of the Right Wing, they failed to understand that the progressive programme of the Forward Bloc, was the direct result of their own initiative and leadership. They further failed to understand that the programme cannot be consistently carried out except on the basis of Socialist ideology. For them Socialism as an independent ideology and party has now practically finished its mission, just because the left-nationalists took up the radical slogans.

To some the Forward Bloc, became an alternative to the Socialist Party—a

left organisation without a distinct ideology, a party embodying an elemental left-revolt became an alternative to Socialism. Those who seek to join the Forward Bloc, do not know that they are demanding a step backward—from Socialism to left-nationalism, from the working class to the petty-bourgeoisie.

If allowed to pursue their own course, they will not only disgrace Socialism but ruin left-nationalism also. The only guarantee of left-nationalism continuing its radical politics is the Socialist leadership and Socialist initiative. Individually joining the Forward Bloc would remove this guarantee and pave the way for the utter ruin of the radicals. Moreover these comrades totally forget that the task of Socialists does not end with the formation of a left bloc organization of radicals. Socialists have still to speak to the people as Socialists, the task of building peoples' unity is still to be achieved. Identification with the Forward Bloc would simply mean that Socialists will be unable to come forward as Socialists; they will not be able to distinguish themselves from the non-socialist Lefts, even when it is necessary to do so.

To identify one-self completely with the Forward Bloc, by individually joining it, is to give up the basic role of Socialism, show a complete lack of confidence in the Socialist ideology and overestimate the radicalism of left-nationalists.

It is extremely regrettable that quite a number of comrades do not understand this. The only correct policy under the present circumstances is that disclosed by the third trend—co-operation, alliance, but no individual joining—a bloc of left elements, through the Left

Consolidation Committee. This gives the Socialists and Communists opportunity to influence the decision of Left-nationalism without identification with it and at the same time gives the freedom to differentiate from the left-nationalists when they fail to keep to their radical professions—an opportunity to give a lead to the left discontent and at the same time opportunity to criticise their mistakes before the public.

The future of the Forward Bloc depends on the decisiveness with which the Socialists and Communists choose to lead it. The rise of the Forward Bloc as an independent organisation is due to the failure of the C.S.P. to take organisational lead in the matter. Yet the programme of the Forward Bloc discloses how deeply left nationalism is influenced by the Socialist movement. To strengthen this influence by patient criticism and independent Socialist practice is the common task before all Socialists. They have to defeat the attempts of those, who seek to direct this genuine discontent into factional channels. They have further to defeat the provocative attempts of the Right to denounce this discontent as merely factional and opportunist and isolate it. Knowing its limitations, they must refuse to join the Forward Bloc and at the same time march at the head of radical forces. At the same time they must avoid the fatal blunder of cutting themselves away from the left discontent. Armed with the Socialist consciousness, devoted to the arduous task of safeguarding national unity from Right disruption and left-mistakes they have to come out every time with their Socialist solution and approach. This alone will save the Socialist movement and with it the growing orientation of the left sections towards a genuinely radical programme.

THE NEW STAGE OF ANTI-JAPANESE WAR

By Chow En-Lai

[The following is a condensed report of a lecture by Commander Chow En-lai before commanders, officers and soldiers of the New Fourth Army, in a meeting at the headquarters of this Army in Anhwei, on March 7, 1939. Commander Chow En-lai is one of the foremost leaders of the Eighth Route Army and Assistant Director of the Political Board of the Central Military Council at Chungking.—Ed.]

WHAT are the results and achievements of the now completed first stage of China's war of resistance? The organised national defense of China, based on the united front, has frustrated the Japanese aim and tactics of "lightning war." China has enforced a prolonged war on the invader. The Japanese military have realised that they cannot finish their campaign of conquest without facing the fact of the prolonged war. They have also realised that the Chinese strategy of the prolonged war, within the conditions of China's national unity and the determined anti-Japanese resistance throughout the country, makes it impossible to destroy the main military forces of China by frostal attacks. Finally they realise that their long-term war also, under the present conditions of China's united resistance, cannot achieve the aim of conquest and enforce China's surrender.

About one-fifth of the territory of China is within the Japanese occupation sphere. With the present strength of Japan's forces in China the occupied zone cannot be extended. We are now

keeping our main forces. The first stage of the anti-Japanese war is thus ended. The only possibility for the Japanese military to extend the invasion of our country is by sending considerable military reinforcements both to the communication bases and to the fronts. But even if they do this, the Japanese military cannot achieve decisive results. For china's defence this would mean merely that the first stage of this anti-Japanese war is not yet over. But the Japanese military cannot send considerable new forces in addition to those already tied up in China. Thus we have arrived at a stalemate.

After the fall of Hankow no larger Japanese reinforcements were sent to China. The Japanese war command is aware that an attack upon Kwangsi and Yunan would necessitate a big new military expedition, which would only dangerously overstrain their own difficulties, besides which it would be impossible to achieve a decisive success through such a campaign, because the conditions would be most unfavourable for the invaders. The Japanese military have realised that they have to change

their policy and that even by a long-term war they cannot achieve their aims of conquest. They are afraid of the prolonged war, as it is beyond their ability to occupy our bases and to cut our transport and supplies, besides being absolutely impossible to destroy our main forces. Their only hope under such circumstances is that changes in the international situation around China, brought about by collaboration and help from their allies, Germany and Italy, will isolate China and destroy its anti-Japanese unity.

How can we enforce an end of the first stage and advance through the second stage toward the stage of counter-attack against the invaders? The policies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are: (1) the prolonged war (2) the war in all directions, on all fronts and in the Japanese rear by the unified armies as well as by the people; (3) to recover the initiative and the ability to proceed from defense to counter-attack. In accordance with these policies we are advancing along the road of determination for a prolonged war, a National United Front for resistance until final victory, and the establishment of our military and economic self-sufficiency in war time. This policy is a correct one. This policy is also our policy and the same idea is shared by all army officers, the soldiers and the people. All support the Generalissimo. There are armies from every province at the front, and the people are being mobilised to join the resistance. Every Chinese army is under the Kuomintang, and all parties including the Chinese Communist Party, are joining the national fight and the anti-Japanese war under the direction of the Generalissimo. It is due to this course and to the organisation of China's

defense that China is helped by international moral and material assistance. China is fighting for its national freedom and thus strengthening the cause of world peace.

As to our tactics in the prolonged war, we are combining regular warfare with guerrilla warfare. The prolongation of the war is not weakening our armies; on the contrary, it makes them ever more organised and unified and through ever closer relations with the people even stronger. The more we fight, the stronger we become. This is the main principle of the prolonged war, mobilisation of the people, and the scorched-earth tactic against the invaders. Our sacrifices are not weakening us, precisely because of the policies and the planful realisation of the prolonged war. In the former stage of the war our principal attention was concentrated upon the weaknesses of the invaders, in order to weaken and exhaust them ever more in the course of their advance into the interior of our big country. In the Shanghai war and in North China about 200,000 of the enemy's forces—killed, wounded or sick—were eliminated from fighting. In the battles for Suchow another 100,000 were eliminated, and nearly 300,000 in the battles for Hankow. This was our tactic in the first stage. We will continue this tactic whenever the enemy may try to repeat or to continue the tactic of frontal attacks upon our main forces. But as the enemy has now realised its great mistakes and miscalculations and is trying to correct its strategy, we will have to pay the greatest attention to its new plans.

The Japanese military in their original plan, calculated that 15 divisions would be sufficient to crush Chinese resistance and enforce

surrender. However, 13 divisions were necessary in order to occupy Shanghai alone. Japan has already been forced to throw many more divisions into this imperialist adventure, and will yet be forced to throw in still more, in the effort to hold its communication lines and to conquer China. Almost 7,000,000 Japanese soldiers, killed, wounded or sick, have been sacrificed and yet the Japanese military are forced to face and they force a charge in China's anti-Japanese policy of national defense. This is the fact the Japanese military are forced to face and they realise it. They are confronted in China, unexpectedly, by the "big war" which they thought would be necessary only against the big Pacific powers.

Japan's maximum in young military forces for war does not exceed three million. One and a half, including those sacrificed through death wounds or sickness, have been directly involved in the China war, and about 500,000 or 600,000 indirectly in Manchuria and elsewhere. This is what the Japanese military had never expected. They cannot enlarge this number without endangering their position as an imperialist aggressor aiming for the domination of East Asia. They are confronted by the task of maintaining their forces intact in the occupied zone, with the least possible loss in killed, sick or wounded. If they continue to be weakened and harassed at the fronts and in the rear their final exhaustion and defeat is inevitable.

The principal tactics of the Japanese military were to meet the demands of the first stage by a quick advance and a quick peace. Up to the occupation of Hankow, they never planned to face the second stage. They found no time

to prepare for it during the first stage and they do not have sufficient military forces to prevent the realisation of our policies in the second stage. Never in the history of Japanese imperialism were they confronted by a war of such magnitude.

No wonder that the Japanese military are getting alarmed over this war. If we compare the China war with the Great war of 1914-18 we see instead of short lines, long ones, in fact unlimited fighting lines in addition to very widely extended fronts of organised guerrilla warfare. In the Great War positional warfare was the principal means of advance or defense, and the advance of the fronts meant the extension of occupied territory, leaving the rear in the hands of the occupants. In the present China war Japanese positional warfare is resulting only in useless sacrifices of the invading forces, without their being able actually to control the occupied territory and to prevent the continuation of resistance in the rear of their invasion. The enemy's forces are widely dispersed and separated from each other on the numerous fronts in China without being able to corner the main Chinese forces and destroy them. Guerrilla warfare and the hostility of the Chinese people in the occupied rear are necessitating the maintenance of a huge army in the occupied zones. The invaders have not enough troops to cope with the conditions for war in a vast continent like China, where the armies and the people are unified against invasion, utilising the vastness of the country, natural fortifications, big rivers and extensive mountain ranges do block the enemy's advance and do exhaust and destroy their very limited forces. For instance the close defense of such

parts of the country as the Yellow River region has for the past one year frustrated the enemy's plan to attack Sian, the important strategic and communication centre in the North-west. The Japanese Army was neither formed nor built for such a war, nor are the Japanese forces sufficient and able to overcome such obstacles. The heavy munitions at the disposal of the Japanese are no longer an all-important factor, under such conditions. The Japanese Navy is absolutely no use in such warfare, which fact is at present responsible for strained relations and friction between the Japanese Army and Navy. What were, before, the strong points of the enemy have now become weak points in the war for the conquest of China.

This explains also the conditions behind the Japanese lines and the fact that we are able to extend our lines into occupied territory and so develop new bases of anti-Japanese resistance. The enemy is forced to keep huge armies in the rear, otherwise it could not protect its communication lines, and the garrisons at the bases, not to speak of controlling politically and economically the territory along the communication lines.

Our situation is not becoming worse with the prolongation of the war while the Japanese situation is rapidly deteriorating. The monthly war expense for each Chinese soldier is estimated at 20 Chinese dollars, while the Japanese monthly war expense is about 300 yen for each Japanese soldier in China. The promise made by the Japanese militarists, that the China war and the occupation of Chinese territory would enrich Japan and Japanese people, has proved to be a monstrous lie. The unpopularity of the China

war is becoming ever stronger among the Japanese people, even among the soldiers. The Japanese military are trying by all means to prevent the Japanese people from learning the truth about the situation in China. Owing to press censorship and the persecution of professors, students and writers, even the Japanese press correspondents are afraid and also not interested, to cover the China war.

At present we are passing through the period of transition from the first to the second stage of the anti-Japanese war. Generalissimo Chiang has defined the aim of the second stage as the change from protection to counter-attack. We have to change from the position of the guest to that of the host* from passive resistance to active attack. We must prepare for the counter-attack. Our political policy and military strategy are both correct, to preserve our main forces, to extend guerilla warfare to prepare, for advance from resistance to victory, through concentration of all means and resources, for attacking the invaders by a war of manoeuvre in all directions. The special characteristic of our policies in the second stage is that we must prevent further invasion by the enemy, and must frustrate all its attempts to fall back and save its own strength by organising traitorous Chinese forces. We must prevent and frustrate all attempts by the invader to proceed from a quick war of conquest to a quick peace. Generalissimo Chiang has again declared that we cannot end this war within one or two years, and we must remember his warning, that to stop midway would mean the destruction of our nation.

* This is a Chinese way of speaking. The guest, according to Chinese etiquette, should take no initiative. He is "passive" and the host "active". Editor.

182797

In order to attain the aim of the second stage, we must also realise that our own difficulties will increase in the present period of transition, from the first to the second, as well as during the second stage itself. We shall face economic, financial, political and military difficulties. We must fight the spirit of depression among our people. We must concentrate all our efforts upon overcoming these difficulties, in order to attain the ultimate victory, through strengthening the co-operation of all parties, through preservation and reconstruction of our bases, raising the fighting strength and the national discipline of our armies and the whole people, as well as through the realisation of democracy. We must multiply the difficulties of the invaders in the occupied territory and attack them at the fronts.

In the second stage we shall have to overcome more difficulties on our side, and we shall have to create ever new and ever more difficulties for the invaders. And let it be constantly in our minds, that whoever first overcomes the difficulties will have the victory.

The invader understands, too, the lessons of the first stage. The Japanese military realise now that the longer we fight the stronger we shall become. They also grasp the fact that Japan's forces alone are not sufficient to attain victory. They are concentrating their efforts on not permitting us to overcome our difficulties, and they too, are trying to multiply our difficulties. This is their new policy.

They are well aware now that their cruel methods of invasion and brutal spoliation of our country and people have only created more hatred

against Japan throughout China. They realise that with the continuation of such methods their difficulties will only increase. The Japanese military have concentrated on establishing puppet governments in the occupied zone, and they see now that this will not bring them any relief. They have declared the Chinese Central Government to be non-existent and now they are trying to cause conflicts within the Central Government. They have maintained before, that they will never deal with the Generalissimo. Opposition to Chiang Kai-shek was declared by them to be tantamount to anti-Communism. But they have seen that such statements and slogans have only made the Chinese people ever more united. They have attacked the interests of Great Britain, the United States and France in China, and now they realise that the only reaction to this policy, on the part of the powers, will be more international assistance to China's self-defence.

The new policy of Japan is based upon the realisation of all these facts. However, its content is merely a change of methods and not of the aims of their campaign for the conquest of China. It is thus nothing but an attempt to deceive China when the Japanese military declare that they want to shake hands with the Chinese people.

In the last four months Japan has attacked the Chinese forces only in the occupied areas. The exception was Hainan, but this was due to the European crisis, and its purpose to create trouble for France and Britain. The Hainan issue is of more importance internationally than for China. In order to attack the Chinese positions in the South, the invaders would have to venture an expedition into the interior of

the Southwest, which would only enlarge their difficulties.

The new policy of Japan was announced in the declaration by Prince Konoye last December. This declaration, containing the programme of the New Order in East Asia, did not lose its importance after Prince Konoye's resignation as Premier. The main purpose of this programme is the conquest of China and the domination of Asia. The Generalissimo's reply to this declaration was the statement that Japan's co-called new policy has no other aim than to destroy the Chinese nation and transform China into another Manchuko. It is the same programme as in the first stage of the anti-Japanese war, and the Japanese New Asia Order is the same deadly menace to China's very existence as a nation.

Prince Konoye failed to achieve the aim of his declaration, but the aim of the Japanese military, who command the Japanese Government has not changed. Japan's policies are determined by its position as an aggressor country, belonging to the Fascist bloc of world aggression. The main points of Fascist strategy as applied by Japan are (1) to expand into new territories in other countries; (2) to find out, and to concentrate upon, the weak points in the world in order to keep on the aggression; (3) to collaborate with strong allies such as Germany and Italy, in order to support each other's aggression; (4) to separate and split the big democratic powers; and (5) to utilise the Anti-Communist Alliance and hostility against the Soviet Union.

In order to split and separate the democratic countries Japan is applying the same tactics as Germany and Italy.

Thus, for instance, the Japanese attitude towards the United States is quite different from its attitude towards Britain. In spite of the fact that the policy of the United States is very strongly against Japan, Japan is anxiously trying to avoid conflicts with the United States, because of its urgent need for American supplies. The Japanese policy towards Britain is to use forceful means as much as possible in order to press Britain to a compromise with Japan. Therefore, the Japanese are keeping the Yangtze closed to British trade; they occupied Hainan, after having already isolated Hongkong from the mainland of Kwangtung; they menace the British leading position in the Foreign Settlement at Shanghai, and they challenge British financial interests by attacking the Maritime Customs.

In the first stage of the war the Japanese attacked British interests because they realized, as they themselves often declared, that an attack against China is impossible without an attack on the interests of Great Britain. At present the Japanese attack British interests in order to press Britain to compromise with Japan by recognising Japan's "right" to swallow China. In Britain the people are sympathetic to China's struggle, and there are also important interests which demand a stronger pro-China policy; however, there are also interests which advocate a compromise with Japan. These contradictions are the source of the vacillation in British Far Eastern policy. It is characteristic of the policy of splitting the powers friendly to China that the idea of cutting China from France and Britain, through pressure on Hongkong and French Indo-China, is advocated at present as a means

to isolate China from all friendly powers except the USSR. Germany, especially, supports this viewpoint, the hope of dividing Britain and the USSR by creating a situation in which only the route from the USSR to China would remain open and thus only Russian supplies would be available for China. However, owing to the growing weakness of Japan it cannot venture at present a campaign into Kwangsi and Yunnan for cutting China's routes to Indo-China and Burma. This was also confirmed by the Japanese statements in connection with the occupation of Hainan, which anxiously tried to assure Britain and France that this occupation was only in order to enforce the blockade against China, and not intended to menace Indo-China or the British possessions in the South China Sea and farther south.

We must fully realize that the new policy of Japan is a most dangerous one in its aim to destroy the Chinese nation. Internationally it is a policy of ever closer combination with Japan's Fascist allies, for helping each other. Japan hopes to utilise in this way Germany's and Italy's action against France and Great Britain in order to force them to give up assistance to China and in order to cut off supplies for the Chinese Government through Indo-China and Burma. Internally it is a policy which no longer relies only on military force, on military invasion and occupation and on attempts to establish puppet Governments, but the new policy aims to destroy China's unity and its determination to resist until ultimate victory, by adding political and ideological invasion to military aggression.

At the beginning of the war the Japanese military declared that China

is just another Abyssinia. Now they state that they are returning to their original home in China, as they themselves are the brethren of the Chinese! Previously they declared that the Kuomintang must be eliminated while now they want a "reformed" Kuomintang with a "reformed" Three Principles of Sun Yat-Sen. Formerly they were satisfied with any traitors as their puppets, now they are asking for Wu Pei-Fu and Wang Ching-wei. They are singing that Japan and China must help each other, and promise that the future relations between these two countries will equal those between Britain and the British Dominions. They advertise it widely that they are fighting only Communism or the Comintern in China. Generalissimo Chiang rightly pointed out that Japan's anti-Communist foreign policy is but a lie to cover its designs of conquest. If Japan is so anxious to fight Communism, why does it not attack the U. S. S. R. instead of China?

The Japanese military are repeating their old contention that China is destined to remain an agricultural country, while Japan's destiny is to be an industrial country and as such the leader in "Sino-Japanese Co-operation." Japan presents itself as a special friend of Mongolia and the Chinese Northwest, and offers its "protection" to the Mohammedans, especially in the Northwest. The Japanese are trying to confuse the Chinese people with such foolish tricks as sending Japanese doctors and nurses "to help their Chinese brethren." In North China they have erected Japanese hospitals in leading cities. There they have also organised two divisions of puppet troops, and are training Chinese traitors in a military school to provide officers for the puppet troops.

They are trying to utilise Chinese armies in order to fight the guerilla troops. They are planning to build new railway lines, especially in the North, for getting closer access to China's raw materials, to bring in Japanese goods, and to destroy the guerillas. They concentrate especially on the tactics of crushing resistance in the occupied areas, to destroy the Chinese forces and bases of resistance in these regions and to eliminate all possibilities of guerrilla warfare. They attacked again and again the Wutaishan bases and now they attack the guerilla bases in Central Hopei. But they have failed to succeed in checking the guerrilla war and they will fail in the future.

They want to destroy the Chinese nation by keeping alive, supporting and utilising backwardness among the Chinese people. They use this spirit in order to make it their instrument in the conquest of China as the Fascists do in their campaigns against the weaker countries. They try to utilise anti-democratic movements and trends, in China and in the world. They demand from the Kuomintang the "reformation" of the Three Principles on the anti-democratic Fascist line. They appeal to Japanese people to emigrate into China "to help the Chinese people," ask Japanese merchants to invest money in China, and deceive the Japanese people by reports of constant victories in China.

The Japanese military are faced with a serious financial crisis in their own country as well as a constant deterioration of Japan's economic position, due to the exhaustive China war and the totalitarian fascist subordination of foreign and internal trade and industry to the needs and aims of aggression and conquest. This is causing many internal

conflicts in Japan. However, the Japanese masses are not yet organised, the political parties are submitting to military pressure and dictatorship while the police power which is controlling the Japanese people is still very strong. The new policy in China is also very useful because the Japanese people have no realisation of the impossibility of the conquest of China and the ruinous way of Japan's policies under military dictatorship. The system of persecution of the political parties, the cruel suppression of any form of opposition against the military regime, the control of thought—all these methods are applied to prevent any expression of the anti-war spirit and to subordinate the Japanese people to the ever-growing war demands as dictated by the military clique.

Japan's new policy regarding China is the response to the enormous difficulties with which they, Japanese military, are confronted in China and in the world. This policy cannot be realised in a short time and we have the time and opportunity to prevent the realisation of this policy. The success or defeat of the new Japanese policy will not be determined by the situation in Japan and the ability of the Japanese military to prevent and to postpone the awakening of the Japanese people, but it will be mainly decided by our subjective efforts, by our ability to maintain and strengthen the national unity for prolonged resistance and national reconstruction, by the strengthening of the fighting power of the Chinese unified armies and their advance to the reorganised, modern national army, by mobilising and organising the Chinese people for participation in the war for China's national freedom, by modern organisation on the basis of democracy. Thus we will attain our aim to free the country from the invaders and to defeat Japanese imperialism. Thus we will build a new China founded on Sun Yat-Sen's Three Principles.

SCIENCE LEARNS THE GOOSE-STEP

By D. D. Kosambi

(Professor of Mathematics, Fergusson College, Poona.)

IN the January issue of the *New Age*,

I suggested that the newly developing Aryan tendencies in Italy might become serious for the scientists, and in particular for one of the world's leading differential geometers, Prof. Tullio Levi-Civita of Rome. At the time those words were written, events that prove this surmise to have been only too well founded, were taking place unknown to me. I give a summary to show what being a scientist means in Fascist countries.

The first news that came to me of the events was that Prof. Levi-Civita had been dismissed from the Editorial Board of the *Zentralblatt für Mathematik*, a leading German journal that gives brief and quick reviews of all mathematical papers, books, articles, of any importance to the research worker. This was not surprising, because the journal has undergone a thorough purge and Aryani- zation in recent months, beginning with the condition that emigres should not get decent reviews, nor be given reviewing work (which carries a purely nominal pay.) The last step was the forced resignation—or more or less dismissal—of Chief Editor Neugebauer, himself an emigre and the outstanding authority on the history of ancient mathematics, particularly the Babylonian, which his researches have set upon on entirely different footing. The dismissal of Levi-Civita caused the purge to assume unexpected dimensions, because almost all

foreign editors of note promptly sent in their resignations in protest.

Now this seems like a minute, unimportant, trifling sort of event, which could be seen as a tragedy only by a scientist who is so isolated as not to feel the vast movements that are taking place in every country in the world to-day. That is not true. Levi-Civita's work is fundamental in geometry and in the whole of modern physics. The paper he wrote with his teacher Ricci in 1901 is the starting point of every profound study on the theory of relativity, as will be seen by reference to any book of technical importance on relativity, say the work of Eddington, or of Einstein himself. Since that year, Levi-Civita has been in the forefront of scientific development. In hydro-dynamics and aerodynamics his theoretical work explained more about the resistance of fluids than could be understood from whole volumes of experimental and empirical observations. Apart from the applications of the theory of relativity to astronomy, many of which he has made himself, his work on the restricted problem of three bodies and the motion of the moon is also fundamental. In addition to his personal contributions, his influence upon students (of whom the Nobel-prize physicist Fermi is one) has been enormous; and his text books have the rare quality of making essential points so clear to readers, that they can start work without

further guidance. Even apart from these, the charm of his personality and his genial attitude to science, as also his interest and unselfishness in promoting scientific discovery, have endeared him to workers who had no pro-semitic leanings.

This sounds like an obituary, and it is. Not an obituary to Levi-Civita, who has a claim to immortality, but an obituary to science under fascism. The reason will be clear from this one fact, that when I wrote offering my sympathy over the *Zentralblatt* affair, I was shocked to get a reply from him that the affair was "*an axial prolongation of the expulsion from all Italian Academies and cultural societies.*" That any academy in the world could think of *expelling* Levi-Civita is incredible, whatever the reasons. He was a member of almost every learned

society that elects mathematicians. This included the *German Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin). Not only the European countries, including the U.S.S.R. but even the U.S.A. extend to him invitations to lecture. He was one of the sixty world scientists in all subjects honoured by the Harvard University at its Tercentenary celebrations three years ago. Yet, now he is a victim of axis politics. The Jews never suffered in Italy, and this very tolerance led to their absorption, and relative diminution in numbers. But now it is considered that influence among the Palestine Arabs can only be gained by public and serious tyrannization over Italian Jews. And science or culture must go by the board. It is the least valuable cargo in the fascist ship of state, to be jettisoned first when storms threaten.

Book Review

"MARXISM IS DEAD"

By Professor Brij Narayan

PROFESSOR Brij Narayan hopes, he says, that his new book will catch the attention of Marxists, and be criticised, but not in terms of abuse. No one is likely to abuse him as violently as he abuses everyone else. Still, perhaps we ought to remind ourselves that one should not denounce a book unless one can really answer its questions. This one will serve a useful purpose as a set of puzzles for Indian socialists to test their minds on.

It falls into three parts. In the first, the author is attacking Marxism,

proving that not only is it dead now, but it was never alive. In the second, he attacks Soviet Russia. In the third he puts forward his own "new" philosophy—the struggle for existence, and national socialism. At the end of the performance, if not at the beginning, he has succeeded in turning himself into a thoroughgoing fascist. Plenty of people, in and out of India, will be grateful to him.

He begins with the argument that Marx was "not original," and describes at great length the ideas of the French

socialist Bazard, who lectured in Paris in 1829. So far as Bazard was correct, Marxists will have no quarrel with him. Marx did not imagine that he had discovered everything alone, and the ideas of Darwin (Mr. Brij Narayan's great hero) were put forward by at least two other men before Darwin wrote. Next he begins to criticise dialectical materialism. One of his points is that Jeans and Eddington are discrediting materialist conceptions—two men whose bogus metaphysics have made some impression on the slipshod "respectable" newspaper public, but are far inferior to even Logical Positivism, as representing the last stage of bourgeois philosophy. Another of his points is that primitive society is savage and quarrelsome, therefore the negation of its negation must also be an epoch of war, and not one of peace as believed by Marxists. If Mr. Brij Narayan would take a little trouble with anthropology, he would learn that the primitive societies that have survived into the modern world—the Australian bushmen, for instance—are *peaceful*, as Engels declared, and that organised warfare only began with the rise of class states. The argument next turns to the theory of surplus value, and claims to show that it has no accuracy. Presumably the bourgeois theories of value, or some of them, are accurate. It does not seem to help bourgeois society very much.

When Mr. Brij Narayan turns to Russia, we find a repetition of Trotsky's "The Revolution Betrayed"—inferior to its original in everything except wilful prejudice. The author has no personal knowledge of Russia, so he is bound to choose his authorities impartially. Instead of that, he passes contemptuously over the Webbs' "Soviet Russia",

the most important book ever written on the subject, and says nothing of dozens of other books by visitors who have been impressed by Soviet achievements. By contrast, anything published by Sir Walter Citrine, or the Right Book Club, or an Italian professor, he seizes upon with gusto. (Later on he proves that socialism can do no good to China, by quoting a British Consul who says so.) "It was not the Russian proletariat", he begins "that made its revolution, but a Party, and it is the same Party that governs Russia today..... Revolutions do not occur in conformity with any cut and dried principles of dialectics..." Lenin, then, overthrew the Tsar by himself; he did not realise how clever he had been; he imagined that it was the workers and peasants, pressed forward by a certain correlation of historical forces, that were overthrowing the Tsar, and that he himself was only helping to guide them. At present, it seems, the Russian workers are poor and exploited. No one doubts they are still poor, but Mr. Brij Narayan will not or cannot see that Soviet economy is expanding every year by leaps and bounds. He does not believe Russian figures, and no one but Colonel Blimp will believe his, so we do not make much progress. An example of his method of criticism is to say that Russian workers must be exploited by socialist piece-work, because Marx denounced capitalist piece-work. Is all factory work bad because Marx denounced capitalist factory work? Has our author read the Webbs' explanation of the Soviet piece-work system?

When he has to speak of Germany, it is just the opposite. "Hitler has done at least as much for the German workers as Stalin for the Russian worker.

Unfortunately, while India is inundated with Russian propaganda(!).....very little information is available about economic conditions in Germany." Of course, any state can achieve full employment by declaring war on somebody, or preparing to do so. Mr. Brij Narayan is "not concerned with the foreign policy of the Hitler Government"—that has nothing to do with its domestic policy! The fact is, as Dr. Borkenau remarks in a new Penguin book worth reading ("The New German Empire"), that in Germany "everyone is working much more than in 1933 but consumes only a very little more than at the worst of the slump. The number of working hours today stands considerably above that of the best days of the boom in 1929, but the amount of consumable goods produced still lies far below that figure. Amidst rekindled furnaces and an actual scarcity of labour the real wages of the individual worker are a good deal below even the starvation wages of 1932." Even so, can the system keep going? Hitler's whole foreign policy is a confession that it cannot.

Mr. Brij Narayan's attitude to Soviet foreign policy is contradictory, but he is especially bitter in pointing out that Russia has "abandoned the policy of world revolution." Let us state the position, without romantic regrets over the failure of Soviet armies to sweep over the world and bring freedom everywhere. After defeating the capitalist armies of intervention, the Russians pursued them into Poland and, with the idea of giving the revolutionary forces of eastern and central Europe a chance to explode. The Russian army was repelled, and European capitalism was able to stabilise itself for a few more years. Should the Red Army have gone

on flinging itself against the world? It would have been a heroic suicide, but no more. Munitions count for as much as enthusiasm, and Russian industry had disappeared. And in most countries the masses were not ready to welcome it. "You cannot win with the vanguard alone." The alternative was propaganda. In this field, it has become evident that the greatest asset is the success of the Five Year Plans. So far from betraying international socialism by concentrating on socialism at home, Russia has given it immense encouragement, quite apart from the fact that without building up industries she could not fight any wars, aggressive or defensive. Socialism is no longer a theory; it is a fact.

The first duty of the Soviets was to safeguard the U.S.S.R. The destruction of the U.S.S.R. would set world socialism back by a century. What then as regards the policy of "alliance with Imperialists"? Was it the French bourgeoisie that made the Franco-Soviet Pact, or the French Popular Front? Is it Mr. Chamberlain who is making an alliance with Russia, or the progressive forces in Britain that are forcing him into it bitterly against his will? (The book has a cover-illustration of Chamberlain and Stalin shaking hands. Lord Rothermere would no doubt think it clever) These alliances are designed to maintain peace, during which all progressive forces can build themselves up; or to defeat Germany if she attacks. In either case, Nazism is doomed, and when it collapses an ultimate world socialism will be a certainty. What was the alternative that threatened until quite lately Soviet isolation, a general coalition, and

partition of Russia. Russia wants international socialism as much as she ever did, to free her from the strain of armaments. Can Mr. Brij Narayan discover any evidence that the Imperialists think her now less of a menace to themselves than they ever did?

He has discovered the key to history in Malthus and Darwin. "There is no recognition in the *Communist Manifesto*" he complains, "of the terrible struggle for existence among nations before which the class struggle pales into insignificance." What lamentable ignorance of history! There have been no *nations*, let alone any struggle for existence among them, except in the last two or three hundred years. But there was plenty of struggling before that, between slaves and masters (Rome), between towns and feudal barons (mediaeval Europe), between different ruling groups (history in general). What nations were struggling for existence when the international mercenaries of Jehangir conquered the Afghan landowners of Bengal? "It is possible for a teacher of Indian history to lecture on the Mahomedan period for years without once mentioning the class struggle." Or without once saying anything sensible, in a bourgeois university! Mr. Brij Narayan thinks that Indian history is a tale of foreign invasions made possible by the Hindu idea of non-violence. Can he point out any invasion of India that was not resisted with arms? When the British came, there were at least a million men in arms all over India; and in spite of "Hindu ideas", the British recruited as many sepoys as they wanted from all castes. Why did Indian resistance always collapse, then? Was it not because India was always torn by class difference, and the dominant classes trod down the

others, quarrelled among themselves, and betrayed India to the invader, just as the Spanish aristocrats have betrayed Spain to the rebels or as the French Fascists would like to betray France?

Mr. Brij Narayan's *biological theory of history* is simple. An oyster, he maintains, has 16,000,000 offspring, most of which must be destroyed by natural enemies. A human being, again, is capable of having a lot of offspring. "Such being the natural law of overproduction, slaughter on an immense scale is necessarily also a law of nature." Thus the arms-manufacturers are performing a basic social service, and are entitled to their 20% dividends! It is no use complaining of fascist aggression! "A virile people cramped for room, will expand." A Japanese peasant, torn from home by conscription and sent to die in Shansi, is not a slave, as one might think; he is simply being virile! The million horses of the French army that were killed in the Great War were exceptionally virile and patriotic horses. They wanted more room in which to work for their masters. Mr. Brij Narayan is an economist, and need not be expected to know much history, but let him read Max Weber, and see how modern capitalism built itself up on the basis of the wars among the dynasties of 16th century Europe; and then fused with the autocratic state to produce the elaborate modern myth of *the Nation*—an accidental product of dynastic wars, with no rational basis in race, culture or economics.

When our theorist comes to treat of particular countries, we see that he knows no more about socialism than any average bourgeois economist does. Why

does he not study our case before condemning it? British workers, he says, would lose their jobs if they lost their empire. So they would (those who have any jobs to lose), if they retained capitalism at the same time. But does he know anything of Britain's modern economic organisation, with its financial strangle-holds, its bottle-necks in each key industry, its ever-increasing cartelisation and monopoly-tendencies behind tariff barriers? If these were swept away, the full employment of British labour and machinery could vastly raise the standard of living, and by exporting capital goods more economically buy all the foreign food that was needed—to say nothing of the economic links that could be forged with the U.S.S.R. So again with Japan. The Japanese people are struggling for existence, but it is the existence of the huge family trusts, the Mitsui and Mitsubishi and the rest, along with the existence of the dominant military clans. Mr. Brij Narayan ought to know that Japan has a million small, parasitic landowners, who artificially keep up the price of food, while their sons, the army officers, call on the people to solve all their troubles by annexing China. He ought to know that the peasants are further exploited by the high price of fertilisers charged by the monopolists, and that because the home market is so starved, industry, based on half-slave female labour, has to export its goods, by cut-throat competition or by war. Manchuria does the Japanese people no good, because the monopolists will not let its cheaper minerals and food compete with their own home productions. He would do well to study Miss Freda Utey's books on Japan, or, if he wants something simpler, some short stories called "The Cannery Boat"

written by a young Japanese who was murdered a few years ago by the police. If ever there were a case of a country driven into war by a vicious class structure, that country is Japan. We need not speak of Japan's rigorous exploitation of Korea, nor of the fact that China is at least as densely populated as Japan, because destruction of the weak is part of the "biological system." But when Mr. Brij Narayan says that Japan could gain nothing from a socialist system, we must pull him up. If it only swept away feudalism and monopoly, and established a rational capitalism, internal reform would do Japan more good than any wars can.

As to Germany, he quotes Hitler's statement that the country must expand because it is overpopulated. But Hitler is doing his best to increase the birthrate. A nation must expand—because it has a high birthrate. It must have a high birthrate—in order to expand, to show its virility. Left to themselves, men do not, in fact breed like oysters. Mr. Brij Narayan may or may not have heard of birth control, but the French population has been stable for a century (while the French empire has expanded—through the intrigues of French financiers). The Russian birthrate, like that of all civilised and progressive communities, is declining towards an optimum point and equilibrium. "Russia is big, and she can build her socialism with her own resources." (She is building socialism then, in spite of Trotsky?) This ignores the fact that Russia before 1914 was far bigger, and was intensely aggressive. The difference is not one of geography, it is the change to a classless society. Any criticism of Russia, however, will do for this writer. "The Soviet Govern-

ment will fight to the last rather than give up a foot of their territory." This makes them as wicked as anyone else. It is all the struggle for existence.

The great lesson, then, is class solidarity behind national frontiers. An unemployed Kentucky miner, and Mr. Henry Ford with his turnover of £40,000,000 a year, have essentially the same interest. They must stand shoulder to shoulder for an attack on the rest of the world—or rather there should be division of labour, the miner looking after the fighting and Mr. Ford looking after the profits. The most fantastic example offered is Spain. Although documents have been published proving an organised Nazi conspiracy in Spain before the war, although the Spanish Communists were not in the Government when the war started, and throughout the war were the backbone of Republican solidarity, although the war was started by aristocrats and generals with previous promises of help from Mussolini (among the few promises he ever kept)—in spite of all these Mr. Brij Narayan lays the whole blame on Russian propagandists in Spain; and this after telling us that Russia long ago lost her interest in revolutions abroad. "The Spanish communists richly deserved the fate that has overtaken them." This, unlike most of the author's grumbings and growlings, is unforgivable.

"Only Marxists who are totally ignorant of Indian facts and problems will imperil swaraj by inflaming class-passions." Swaraj, we all agree, comes first, and Indian Marxists have emphasised the fact more than anyone else in the country. Mr. Brij Narayan is also right in criticising Norman Angell's thesis that Britain is sucking no big

profits out of India (though he is less correct in thinking the petty colonies, which Hitler pretends are his only colonial aims, equally profitable). But who is inflaming class passions most? Is it not the wage-cutting millowner and rackrenting landlord? Are the Thakur Sahib of Rajkot's privileges essential to the united front? China is asserting herself because the masses are interested, and they are interested because the Chinese Soviets woke them up and forced the old Kuomintang Government to make some progress. It is an odd thing that Mr. Brij Narayan has long been known as a peasant leader, and a thorn in the side of his landlord neighbours. He knows that his own Provincial Government at least has less than no desires for swaraj. As a Darwinist, however, he ought to encourage the peasants to starve quietly. That would not only cement the united front, but would increase the national vigour by ensuring the survival of the fittest—namely zamindars and men who sit in offices near the Stock Exchange and corner markets!

Capitalism need not impoverish the workers, he goes on; their conditions can improve—"given an uninterrupted expansion of capitalism." (Given *that*, anything might happen anywhere.) The State can supervise industry and ensure good wages. Nor is it necessary to abolish landlords in order to abolish rents. The State can wipe out rents by taxation of incomes. (If the landlords are unusually non-violent.) Does he really not see that unless workers and peasants press their demands themselves, this abstract "State" of his, will never do anything for them? Instead of reforms following swaraj, they will still be invited to go on supporting the

bourgeoisie while the latter prepares, in accordance with biological law, to attack and swallow up Burma, Ceylon, Siam, and so on. But let us allow Mr. Brij Narayan his belief in this Utopian of "national socialism." Then why not a Punjab national socialism, or a struggle for existence between Hindus and Mahomedans? He believes that differences in natural wealth among various countries will make any future union impossible. Will they not make Indian unity impossible, and should they not have made the union of the American States impossible? He swallows whole the bourgeois myth that the national-state has always existed and will always exist, in a condition of perpetual war. "If I were asked to choose between a world economy and British Imperialism, I would, without a moment's hesitation, choose the latter. Exploitation by a single Imperialist country is a lesser evil than exploitation by the whole world." Is every state in the U.S.A. being oppressed by every other?

Of course, Mr. Brij Narayan's "Darwinism" has very little connection with the real ideas of Darwin. Unfortunately Darwin's ideas were easy to steal and distort and use for purposes of militarist and imperialist propaganda, and this crude use of biological concepts

by popular writers, with no knowledge of biology, is still quite flourishing. The animal world shows hardly any "struggle for existence" among members of the same species, and even if it did, there is no reason why we should feel bound to behave exactly like lions or bears. Mr. Brij Narayan would be well advised to study Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid", in which this philosopher and naturalist opposed the original pseudo-Darwinists in the field of sociology, and showed that in the animal world there is far more of co-operation than of indiscriminate ferocity. But the real moral of all this—that socialism is to be blamed for its inadequate progress in India, when such stuff as "Marxism is Dead"—can be turned out by a man sincerely concerned for the national welfare. If we had done more thinking, talking and writing about the basic ideas of socialism, there would be a strong socialist movement stirring up every province, and a writer like Mr. Brij Narayan would at any rate not have drifted into pure fascism. Let us discuss socialists less, and socialism more. Let us have research work by groups of theoretical and technical experts on the application of Marxism to Indian history, industry, and general conditions. Then we shall hear no more in this country about the international struggle for existence.

THROUGH SOCIALIST INITIATIVE TO NATIONAL UNITY

SINCE we wrote last, the world has witnessed breath-taking events one after another. Europe perpetually hovers on the brink of an aggressive war. The Fascist *coup* against Danzig, against Poland which was to be another prelude to totalitarian conquest, is not yet defeated. It is only delayed and postponed. Hitler's hordes are merely biding their time to secure another victory against democracy, against the democratic will of the peoples.

Driven by popular pressure, Chamberlain is forced to open negotiations with the Soviet for a peace pact. But he successfully prolongs the negotiations and refuses to come to terms with the U.S.S.R. He hoodwinks the British people who demand united resistance to fascism. In secret, Chamberlain's underlings plan another diabolical plot, to strengthen Fascism by offering it a huge loan and raw materials, which Nazi Germany is sure to utilise for intensifying its war against democracy.

Taking advantage of the European situation, Chamberlain has taken the first step to plan out one of the biggest and most sinister betrayal in history. The sell-out of fighting and democratic China to marauding Japan is the latest fruit of Chamberlain's policy. **Everywhere Fascism scores on the basis of national disunity. Everywhere the pro-fascist gangs are able to prevent the victory of popular will by creating dissensions, confusions and**

disappointment. Everywhere the same lesson is taught. Unless the working class and its parties are able to unite the entire people in a common front against fascism and for democracy, people must pay the price.

India is no exception to this general rule. The common sentiment of opposition to British Imperialism is no longer enough to keep national unity. Everything now depends on how effectively and immediately this opposition takes material shape. Delay in the counter-offensive of the people against British domination, whatever may be the excuse advanced, means abject capitulation before British power, means disintegration of the national forces. It means playing the same role which German Social Democracy played on the eve of the Fascist seizure of power.

The Indian scene shows the same vacillations, the same urge of the masses to move forward, the same secret plotting against the people, and finally the same lack of unity.

Determined to draw India into its war plans, British imperialism follows a policy of blood and iron, on every front unparalleled repression is launched. The State's peoples' struggle is crushed with the utmost ferocity; political prisoners are not released, but are allowed to die in jail, despite the united popular demand for their release; pressure is brought on the Congress

Ministries to suppress the workers' and peasants' struggles and compel them to form a "common front" with Maxwell & Co.

At the same time imperialism follows its war-preparations with lightning rapidity. India is already converted into a base for its war-designs. Troops are freely transported to Middle East, to guard the interests of Imperialism. The Indian Air Force is strengthened by the addition of new bombers.

The Federation Conspiracy which forms a plank in the Imperialist war-programme is pursued with unabated vigour. The Princes are alternately blackmailed and cajoled to join the common front against the Indian people.

In this grave and menacing situation, the National Leadership pursues its relentless course of compromise and vacillation. Instead of organising a national counter-offensive and stemming the rot, the High Command forbids militant mass movements. Congress Ministries repress the growing urge of the people to struggle. Every Manifestation of mass discontent is suppressed with bureaucratic high-handedness.

This policy of capitulation found its crassest expression when the Bombay A.I.C.C. subordinated the Provincial Congress Committees to the Ministries and placed a ban on Satyagraha or any kind of extra-parliamentary movement.

Right Splitters at Work

The two policies that seek to guide the national destinies came into open conflict on the 9th July. The policy of struggle versus the policy of compromise. The left joined its forces together, consolidated them into the Left Consolidation Committee and decided to sound the alarm. Left Unity which had

scored important successes in the Bombay A.I.C.C. session, now decided to make an open appeal to Congress masses to intervene and prevent the complete subordination of the Congress to constitutionalism. Meetings were held all over the country on the 9th of July. **The voice of struggle, the voice of unity spoke in unambiguous terms.**

What has been the reaction of the High Command to 9th July Demonstrations? The High Command is indignant and angry. It has announced its decision to take disciplinary action against those who participated in the 9th July demonstrations. Its policy is to purge the Congress of left-elements. Its policy is first to split the left-forces, undermine left unity in order to stifle the voice of uncompromising struggle. By its disciplinary measures it seeks to tame the wavering elements, and isolate the rest. It has three different remedies for the three dominant left groups. It knows the vacillations of the Congress Socialists. It therefore seeks to win them over. It seeks to discredit the Forward Bloc elements, by focussing attention on the mistakes of their leaders, of which there have been many. Witness for example the ferocity with which Subhash Babu's anti-prohibitionist statement—a statement which was not only harmful, but unworthy of any left leader—was repeatedly attacked. It was an obvious attempt to make easy capital out of a false move. Finally the Right Wing wishes to crush the communists with open force—witness the U. P. Circular against Communists, which, to say the least, is nothing short of a declaration of war against a section of the Nation.

The situation becomes still more critical with the vacillations in the left-rank itself. If the 9th July demonstrations

expressed a growing urge towards left-unification, it also expressed the inherent weaknesses in left-ranks which ought to be immediately removed. The threat of disciplinary action has created misgivings in the minds of certain left elements. The same threat on the other hand is welcomed by one section as a triumph of the left cause. These are alarming tendencies which spell ruin, not only for left unity but for national struggle. They encourage the compromisers to apply pressure to split the Left. They arise out of a fundamental misconception about the role of left unity.

The Responsibility of the Left

What does the left represent to-day? For whom does it speak? The left is no longer a critical opposition. It does not speak for this or that section. It seeks to give an alternative policy to the national movement. That policy is the policy of immediate and uncompromising struggle against British Imperialism. It is in an advantageous position, because the programme for immediate action is already to be found in the resolutions of the Annual Sessions of the Congress. From a critical opposition the left has developed into a national force. It carries therefore the double responsibility for maintaining national unity, unity of the Congress, and making the Congress an efficient instrument of struggle.

That responsibility today falls up on the shoulders of the left, just because the Right follows a policy of compromise which leads to the disruption of national unity. Two policies, two lines, therefore, confront each other in the national arena. The chances of pushing the Nation towards struggle, depend entirely

on the left-forces. The lead for that cannot come from the Right. Only in the measure that the left stands united and faces the offensive of the Right without allowing its ranks to be broken, will it succeed in strengthening the Congress and with it the national struggle. Left unity is the key to national unity. Those who abandon it under any pretext, as the opportunist Roy group has done, have no right to talk of struggle and against drift. To be a party to abandon left unity is to surrender before the disruptive offensive of the Right. The critical international situation, the planned betrayal of China, the growing repression in India and the utter failure of the Right wing leadership to meet the situation, its suicidal drive against the left, teach only one lesson: either the united left forces stand together and overcome the vacillations of the Right or the Nation is dragged into the mire of compromise.

No Parallel Congress

The same situation also warns us against false interpretations of left-unity. Left unity is not a substitute for national unity but an instrument for it. No left-organisation can be considered as a substitute for the National organisation. To save the Congress from disruption is the foremost task of the left. The expulsion of the left elements, or disciplinary action against lefts, has to be treated as serious breaches of national unity and cannot be welcomed as triumphs of the left forces as Subhas Babu has done.

Unfortunately this perspective is often missed by some prominent left-leaders. Subhas Babu himself is guilty of such lapses. In his enthusiasm for the Forward Bloc he often forgets that the Bloc

is no substitute for the Congress. In one of the meetings in Bombay he talked of Forward Bloc and the National Congress as two distinct organisations, contrasted their policies and asked the people to join the Forward Bloc. This is nothing but a wild dream of a parallel organisation—which will split national unity, the National Congress and discredit the left forces. While Subhash is moderate and well balanced in his criticism of the Right, some of his followers outbid the communalists in their abuse of the Congress leadership. On the 9th July, the President of the Forward Bloc meeting in Calcutta denounced the Congress regime as a Czarist regime and demanded that it be put to an end. Such drivelling nonsense, coming from one who presides over a left meeting, is nothing short of provocative disruption.

Drawing exaggerated conclusions from the enthusiastic receptions accorded to him, Bose often thinks that the Forward Bloc alone can push ahead without the aid of other left groups. Herein he simply misleads the left and unconsciously plays the game of the Right. Let it be understood clearly that no left-group by itself is sufficiently powerful to overcome disruption and compromise. It may sound heroic to exaggerate one's strength, but it is nonetheless childish and disruptive.

Failings of the Forward Bloc

The followers of the Forward Bloc and Bose himself must understand that the problem of national unity is a serious problem. The problem of launching struggle through the Congress is in the end one of winning the masses for struggle. Petty intrigues inside the Congress and formal majorities do not create

the necessary sanctions for a nation-wide struggle. The Forward Bloc is the weakest of all the left groups so far as power to develop mass-sanctions is concerned. And it cannot substitute this by opportunist alliances within the Congress, by forming an unprincipled anti-Right bloc.

A warning is necessary against such tendencies, because of late, they have become increasingly manifest. If they are allowed to go unchecked they will transform the Forward Bloc, behind which stands genuine discontent of a section of left-elements, into a factional bloc. The Forward Bloc is the product of genuine left-discontent, and its politics must be free from opportunism. The danger of its going the wrong way is real just because the Bloc came into existence on the crest of an elemental discontent against Right disruption. Its discontent was not steeled by patient mass-work and patient struggle against disruption. Its outlook is not yet disciplined by a clear-cut ideology. In essence its politics is determined only by its reaction to the moves of the Right.

These short-comings in the left camp are no doubt serious. But they cannot be made an excuse for disrupting left unity. They cannot be made an excuse for running away from left consolidation. The question is whether in spite of mistakes and lapses, the forces behind the Forward Bloc are left forces or not? Every one will have to reply in the affirmative. And if that is so, if the dominating trend inside the Forward Bloc is Left, then it is impossible for a radical to leave the Left Consolidation on any ground whatsoever. Ideological excuses under such circumstances constitute a cloak to cover retreat before the Right offensive.

But one thing is clear. The danger, of the Forward Bloc being transformed into a rigid Left Nationalist Party, a rigid organisation without a distinct ideology and without also experiences of mass-work behind it, increases ten fold, the responsibility of the proletarian forces—of the forces, who accept Marxism-Leninism. If there is any lesson to be drawn from contemporary events, it is this, that finally, only the proletarian forces—the forces of socialists and communists—can bring order into popular ranks and stave off and defeat the offensive of the ruling class, and put an end to disruptive tendencies. The ability of the Socialists and Communists to head and lead every discontent, shape and iron it, by practical action and patient criticism, is the final decisive factor in any people's struggle today. Reformism in Socialist ranks manifests itself in its cowardliness before disruption, in its refusal to face the complicated problems of national unity, in short, in its refusal to guide the diverse currents into the channel of all-embracing unity.

Proletarian Line of Unity

This special responsibility of the Socialist forces is often forgotten by a number of socialist leaders. For Communists and Socialist the two conflicting lines now seen in the national arena arise from two different class-origins. The line of compromise is the line of the Indian bourgeoisie; the line of consistent struggle and all-embracing unity is the line of the proletariat—the working class. The problem for Socialist and Communists is to shift the popular balance in favour of the proletarian line, in favour of immediate struggle.

The persistent struggle of socialists for national unity and offensive releases one

section after another from its old illusions. Left discontent continues to gather and spread under the impact of Socialist action and initiative. Divorced from Socialist ideology if runs in all directions. Once more the socialists have to step in and guide it in the proper channels. Lack of Socialist initiative leads to formation of Left groups and parties without a distinct ideology as has happened in the case of the Forward Bloc. The danger of national disruption increases.

The responsibility of the Marxian forces therefore increases ten-fold. Their role as generators of left discontent by mere agitation is replaced by another and more important one—that of organising and leading, so that it becomes a powerful lever of national unity.

Strengthen Left-Consolidation

The formation of Forward Bloc as a distinct left group has placed this responsibility on the socialist forces. The hesitation of the Socialists till now has already created misgivings about the socialist movement. Socialist prestige has suffered and with it the only ideology that can serve as a correct guide to national action has gone in the estimation of two left-nationalists. This failure to act as the spearhead of the left is fostering left nationalist illusions about a parallel Congress and paving the way for national disruption under provocative attack from the Right.

Once more the same bitter lesson is being repeated in India. Socialist hesitation threatens to disrupt national unity. Lack of socialist initiative and leadership endows crude left-nationalism with a halo which it never deserves. On the top of this comes the division among socialist forces, a division which is being

deliberately fostered by those who have taken to expounding "the new cult of Non-violent Socialism". This unbearable situation can be ended in one way only. More than ever it has become necessary to throw overboard all hesitations and vigorously pursue the efforts for left unity and consolidate it. The patient work of the past few years, the great awakening among the masses created by socialists, has to be properly harnessed for the purposes of impregnable unity and struggle. **Socialist initiative and leadership through left-unity is the prime need of the hour.** The Left Consolidation Committee must be made into a model defender of national unity and an evergrowing source of inspiration to all those who stand for struggle. The tendency to divert the growing discontent into factional channels can be defeated only if all socialists stick to the Left Consolidation, notwithstanding the treachery of Roy, not withstanding the lapses of Bose and the misapprehension of Pt. Nehru.

To be able to do this effectively a united Socialist Party has become an urgent necessity. Unity can be delayed only at the expense of Socialist movement, at the expense of left unity, at the expense of national struggle itself. **Only a united socialist party can act firmly and without hesitation. Only a united party will bring order in left ranks and thereby check the compromising tendencies in the national movement. Only such a party can once more become the spear-head of the left forces and act as such.** Relying on its basic strength among the Kisans and workers, the united party will be able to swerve the non-socialist lefts

towards the masses and practically demonstrate to them how to fight the drift and at the same time develop national unity.

Socialist Unity, the Only Guarantee

Socialists who hesitate to achieve unity are unconsciously contributing to disruption. They are weakening the only force capable of stemming disruption—the force of socialism, the force of the proletariat. The International developments have uttered the gravest warning to the socialist movement in this country. The sell out of China, the development over Danzig, cannot be matters of indifference to those who accept international socialism. The ruling classes are emboldened to plan these betrayals, because reformism in International Socialist ranks weakens popular resistance by failing to lead it. The same fate will overtake India if the Socialist movement fails at this critical juncture. Unity inside socialist ranks to act as the spear-head of the unity of the left through the left Consolidation—this ought to be the immediate slogan of every socialist. For, this alone will enable socialists to bring about national unity and launch a nation-wide struggle. They alone will save the nation from a disgraceful compromise and save socialism from being utterly discredited. The alternative is collapse of socialism leading to national disunity and the victory of Imperialism over the popular forces. Let not the bitter lesson taught in other countries be repeated in India.

The Socialist forces must seize the initiative before it is finally lost. The National offensive week planned by the

Left Consolidation Committee must see socialists at the head, leading the left and unifying its ranks. The Left challenge against war, for nation-wide

struggle, must thunder forth during the week. Imperialism must realise that it has to reckon with socialism before it can hope to disrupt the popular front.

SAVE THE "N. F."

MAKE THE "NATIONAL FRONT" LIVE

The "National Front" requires all the assistance that our comrades can give. It has been restarted after a week's hold-up. The N. F. should not stop for a single week again. This will be possible only if all the comrades determine to see that Comrade Joshi's appeal for funds is fully responded to.

P. C. JOSHI WRITES :

The "National Front" is on its legs again. We do not have the needed Rs. 3000, but only Rs. 2158-6-0

We appeal to our comrades to see that the N. F. is firmly set on its feet.

NEW AGE.

