

The Italo-Ethiopian War and the Tasks of the United Front

By M. ERCOLI

ONE of the problems upon which the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern concentrated its attention was that of imperialist war and the struggle against the war danger. For the solution of this problem the Congress gave us most precise instructions, on the basis of a profound analysis of the situation in which the danger of a new imperialist war becomes more acute every day. The events which have unfolded during the last two months make it possible to verify the correctness of the prospects foreseen in this sphere by the Seventh Congress, and at the same time to reveal the fact that there are a number of defects and weaknesses in the anti-war struggle being conducted by the international proletariat and broad sections of the toiling masses, which must be overcome without delay.

The Congress of the Comintern which took place in August of this year did not limit itself to merely pointing out the serious danger which menaces the cause of peace, and exposing the fascist countries as the obvious instigators of a new imperialist war. It also emphasized the need to unite the workers of all political currents for the effective struggle against war as being a most urgent task. If we are able to fulfill this task, our Congress declared, then, the position being what it is, there is a hope that we can prevent the outbreak of a new imperialist war, or at least delay it considerably.

Now, after the expiration of these three months, everyone is convinced that our estimation of the objective situation has been confirmed in all respects. *A new imperialist war has broken out* in the shape of the armed attack of Italy upon the Ethiopian people.

It has led to a new sharpening of the entire international situation, and we have already been within a hair's breadth of an armed conflict between two great imperialist powers—Italy and England. Such a conflict would have meant the beginning of a new world war. All the facts speak with horrifying clarity; they are far more eloquent than discussions and theses.

But do the resistance and struggle of the working class against war correspond to the tasks imposed on us by these facts which are of such tremendous importance? No, far from it! With the exception of a few countries, no unity of the working class has yet been developed in the anti-war struggle. There has not yet been achieved the degree of mobilization and activity of the working masses which is essential in order to fight against the war that is in being, and prevent it from spreading further to horrifying dimensions. In this respect we are wanting to a serious and alarming degree. It is to this that we must primarily draw the attention of all revolutionary workers and Com-

munists, and also of the workers of all other political currents and of all those who are in favor of peace. We must as quickly as possible unite all our forces so as to eliminate this weakness and so that the broad sections of the toiling masses who loathe war will not be caught unawares. These masses can avert or postpone the outbreak of war by the struggle they carry on. But if we are to achieve this, we must *lead* this struggle of the masses against imperialist war and thus prevent the instigators of war—the fascists—from bringing their foul, provocative work of preparing for a new world war to a successful conclusion.

* * *

Perhaps some people will object that we are exaggerating the danger of world war, and that all this is not so terrible. They will say that the war that Italian fascism has undertaken for the conquest of Ethiopia is only a new colonial campaign, a "little" war on the lines of those which both before and since the World War have drowned the so-called "backward" continents in blood, and the consequences of which the great imperialist robbers have always been able to regulate between themselves. But we assert that this point of view is absolutely wrong.

In actual fact the African adventure of Italian fascism is the result of the policy which fascism has been pursuing for many years now of preparing for and provoking war on a European and on a world scale. Italy's African adventure is closely connected with all the other burning problems of international politics. Ever since its advent to power, Italian fascism has been pursuing a policy of imperialist expansion, dictated by the interests of the most reactionary and chauvinist circles of the bourgeoisie and in direct contradiction to the interests of the proletariat and the peasantry.

In Italy itself this process was based upon an extremely rapid process of concentration and centralization of industry, the reorganization of the whole of the national economy for the purpose of obtaining the maximum independence for Italy from foreign countries, and of facilitating her war adventures.

At whose expense was this reorganization of Italian economy brought about? At the expense of the workers whose wages were relentlessly reduced, at the cost of mass dismissals from the factories, at the expense of the unemployed who were deprived of material assistance and doomed to rely upon charity, at the expense of the small and middle peasants who were subjected to growing impoverishment and pauperization in consequence of the fact that the large agricultural farms and big capitalist associations which had secured control of the agricultural market were put under the care of the state.

Now more clearly than before the full meaning of the economic policy of fascism is revealed as one which paves the way for imperialist aggression. In order to bring about these preparations, the reactionary bourgeoisie had to abolish all the liberties and conquests of the working class and the people. In Italy the creation of the objective factors necessary for imperialist aggression could not fail to bring about a sharpening of class contradictions, and this in turn demanded the estab-

lishment of a regime of more open reaction. And after five years of devastating crisis, of ever-growing economic difficulties, mass unemployment, of a tremendous decline in wages, and an acute agrarian crisis, when, despite all the increased demagoguery of the fascists, the discontent of the masses who have been forcibly driven into fascist organizations and subjected to the totalitarian regime for seven long years, is beginning to be felt even in the fascist organizations themselves—now fascism is proceeding to realize its war plans.

The policy of Italian fascism inside the country, to prepare the war it has initiated, is quite a clear one. Equally clear are the conditions and the causes which arise out of the internal situation in Italy which have inspired Italy to begin her war of expansion *just at this moment*. But these conditions and causes are operating with just the same relentlessness, and in other cases with even greater force, in an entire group of European countries, which are oppressed by fascist dictatorship, and first and foremost in Germany. The war path taken by fascist Italy is the same path as that which National-Socialist Germany is preparing to take. Germany has already gone so far along this road, and continues to proceed along it at such a furious rate that the war which is being kindled by the National-Socialists threatens to be a much more monstrous and dangerous explosion than that provoked by Italian fascism.

Italian fascism has undertaken her military adventure just now not only because her home policy and the situation inside the country drove her to do so, but first and foremost because of the international position of Italy, the extreme instability of her situation, and also the growth of contradictions, the solution of which Italy hopes to find in war alone.

Italian fascism has always pursued a "revisionist" policy on the international arena by doing its utmost to find feasible excuses for starting a war for the redivision of the globe by force of arms. German National-Socialism is pursuing the same policy.

Italian fascism has been pursuing many different aims in Europe. The chief objects of its imperialist longings were the Balkans and Central Europe. Even now it does not relinquish these plans. But it has changed its front and has concentrated a considerable part of its energies upon realizing its aggressive plans in Africa. Moreover, this change of front took place at a time when Italian fascism had become convinced of the fact that it would meet with the most energetic resistance in Europe from its rivals, if it should try to realize its aggressive plans, and that these plans could not, therefore, be achieved immediately. Thus from the international point of view, the Italian adventure in Africa should be regarded as the first stage of armed conflict, brought about by many years of struggle in Europe on the part of the more aggressive imperialist powers, first and foremost of Italy and Germany, who are striving for a new division of the world, without which, as they have declared, they cannot exist; in other words, they are striving for a new war.

The war which has been begun by Italy has such deeply rooted causes and is on such a broad scale that it should be obvious to every-

body that it will not remain in its first stages. Since it is first and foremost the result of furious competition between rival imperialist powers, enacted primarily on the European arena, the Italo-Ethiopian war can not be regarded as an ordinary colonial adventure which is taking place somewhere far away in Africa. This war makes European problems more acute. Its influence is felt primarily in Europe and affects the entire European situation, which is already sufficiently complicated and unstable. War in Ethiopia is causing new complications, the whole seriousness of which cannot be fully defined as yet. But it can be said even now that these complications are the most serious that have arisen in the international situation since 1914.

Thus, the war of Italian fascism against Ethiopia cannot be considered an episode of secondary importance, as just one of the "ordinary" colonial wars and expeditions which have abounded during the post-war years. It is much more correct to appraise this war as the culmination of the period of "little" wars, signifying the advent of a period of "big" wars, i.e., of wars between the great imperialist powers for a new division of the globe.

* * *

This conclusion is confirmed by the changes which the international situation has undergone in connection with the Italo-Ethiopian war, and in consequence of it.

During the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, in characterizing the international situation we not only pointed to its extremely complicated and unstable character, but also emphasized the extreme aggressiveness of the group of fascist powers, and the fact that two fascist countries—Germany and Japan—are openly preparing a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. What is more, we added that there are capitalist states which are interested, at the present moment, in defending the status quo and maintaining peace, and we stressed at the same time the extremely dangerous part being played by British imperialism, by directly and indirectly supporting the aggressive policy and anti-Soviet intrigues of German National-Socialism.

It cannot be said that the Italo-Ethiopian war has *radically* altered the position, but it must be recognized that it has already brought about such a regrouping of forces and raised new problems with such rapidity, that radical and fundamental changes may arise extremely rapidly and suddenly which will lead us directly into a new war.

England's hostile attitude to Italy's aggression in Ethiopia could have been foreseen. Any state that dares more or less openly to raise the question of a revision of the map of the world for the purpose of redistributing colonial plunder will inevitably find itself confronted with this hostile attitude.

By defending the status quo in the colonial world, British imperialism defends its own key positions in Africa, the Near East and the Indian Ocean, it defends its own great communication routes, it defends its domination over the largest section of the colonial world. The only thing that can surprise us is that England's resistance revealed itself with such force that it almost led to an outbreak of war in the Mediter-

ranean and war in Europe, and that *this war not only raises the problem of gaining possession of Ethiopian territory hitherto independent, but also raises the tremendous problem of a new division of the whole world by force of arms.* This problem is not one that is specifically "African", "English", or "Italian". It is a European, a world problem. And the Italo-Ethiopian war is showing that the imperialist robbers can no longer delay the solution of this problem, but are preparing to solve it at whatever cost.

It is not a question as to whether Italy and England can temporarily solve their African conflict, and on what basis. The Italian and English robbers have, of course, plenty of opportunity of arriving at an agreement about the Ethiopian people. But the point must be stressed that the African adventure undertaken by fascist Italy has shown British imperialism that henceforth its own safety is menaced by the aggression of the fascist states. Will the British bourgeoisie draw the conclusion from these experiences that it is more advantageous for them to fight on the side of those countries which are defending the cause of peace, with the Soviet Union, to fight on behalf of collective security which would be an obstacle in the way of the fascist aggressors? There is no foundation for replying to this question in the affirmative. True, British statesmen have conducted their entire struggle against Italian imperialism under guise of defending the League of Nations, but this by no means signifies that the wolf has been changed into a lamb. There is not a single *fact* which can be brought in to testify to any change in the policy of the English bourgeoisie.

Yet it is just this policy which the peoples of Europe have to a considerable extent to thank for the fact that Germany has rearmed itself, that a military and naval agreement exists between England and Germany, and that German National-Socialism is growing more and more aggressive. The differences in the English and French camp in connection with the Ethiopian war, on the contrary, have encouraged the strengthening of the ties between British imperialism and German imperialism, and have helped to strengthen Germany's position in the conduct of her policy of aggression and war.

On the other hand, the policy of supporting the League of Nations and its statutes, as pursued by British imperialism, has strengthened England's position throughout the continent of Europe. Today, however, this on no account constitutes a factor making for peace. It more likely encourages the success of all those elements which are more or less hostile to the peace policy of the Soviet Union and are trying to create a new situation in Europe which will best guarantee the successful realization of the plans to "localize war in the East", *i.e.*, attempts to find the road to the solution of the imperialist contradictions in war against the Soviet Union. The reactionary bourgeoisie of England look upon "localizing war in the East" as a good way of getting out of the present position, in face of the direct menace which threatens her colonial empire.

In actual fact, up to the present, the most obvious effect of the Italo-Ethiopian war upon the European continent has been the consol-

idation of the position of German National-Socialism. The National-Socialist war instigators were compelled to retreat a few months ago under the powerful pressure of the active peace policy of the Soviet Union, France and Czechoslovakia, and because of the resistance offered by the masses; but now they have once more increased their activities and taken a series of steps which can cause serious disquiet among the friends of peace, and which have already led to some alarming successes of a partial nature.

The plans to create a bloc of reactionary states around National-Socialist Germany in the center of Europe, with a view to preparing and beginning war on the Soviet Union, are taking on a more and more definite and menacing shape. Signs of a new German orientation by Austrian fascism on the international arena are beginning to make their appearance. The war has also made it possible for a change to take place in Italian policy in the direction of a renewal of collaboration with Germany. National-Socialism is spreading its intrigues to several new countries, like Belgium, for example. And all this is taking place at a time when the reactionary forces hostile to the peace policy of the Soviet Union are being mobilized in all countries. The furious campaign of the fascists and their patrons in France, campaigns in France, Rumania, and other countries against the peace policy of the Soviet Union, and several other facts show that throughout Europe there is a mobilization and growth of the military parties which are urged on by the prospects of an immediate explosion, opened up before them by the Italo-Ethiopian war. The change in the government of Czechoslovakia is to a certain degree a reflection of the same tendencies.

But why examine only what is taking place in Europe? In the Far East, the Italo-Ethiopian war has freed the hands of the Japanese militarists still more, and they are proceeding along the road to conquering the whole of China with more determination than ever before; they are more and more openly displaying their aggressive intentions in relation to the Mongolian People's Republic, and are only waiting for Europe to give the signal for them to begin an advance against the Soviet Union. Any day now the whole of China may find itself enclosed in a new, tremendous conflagration.

And so, war has begun in Africa, and all the resources of a big power like Italy have been thrown into the abyss of war. Europe is shaken from top to bottom by the adventure undertaken by Italian fascism. The Far East is in conflagration. The forces which are making for a new world war are growing with menacing rapidity, and a situation is being created which more and more favors criminal intrigues directed both openly and covertly towards organizing an attack upon the socialist fatherland of all toilers. Are not all these facts enough to cause the alarm to be raised?

* * *

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern most energetically confirmed and emphasized the fact that the possibility exists of barring the road taken by the instigators of imperialist war, and that the struggle for peace is not doomed to failure; that it is possible to postpone and,

under certain conditions, to prevent the outbreak of war against the Soviet Union. These fundamental declarations were, and still remain, correct even in conditions today, when war has already begun between Italy and Ethiopia. At the same time the Congress pointed out that the cause of peace can be saved only if certain conditions are fulfilled, the first and foremost of which is *that unity of action by the working class be achieved in the struggle against war and fascism.*

It is this unity of action by the working class which can and should mobilize in defense of peace all the non-proletarian sections of the people who are against war, namely, the peasants, the women, the youth, the intellectuals, the masses with pacifist inclinations. This is why the Executive Committee of the Comintern, fulfilling the decisions of the Congress, did everything possible to bring about unity of action in the struggle against war, as soon as the danger of war took definite shape, and twice made proposals to the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International to set up a united front, while still not too late, between the Socialist and Communist workers on an international scale. In the eyes of working class public opinion throughout the world we have quite definitely established who is responsible for the fact that the united front has not been achieved on an international scale. The responsibility lies with the Right wing of Social-Democracy which still continues to prefer unity with the bourgeoisie to unity with the proletariat; the leaders of the Right wing acted like strikebreakers. We must act energetically against those who jeer at our assertion that working class unity can prevent the outbreak of war or at any rate postpone it. The arguments of these people can be reduced to the statement that a meeting between a few Socialist and Communist leaders in some European town or other will not stop either the guns of Mussolini or the cruisers of the English. But it is not a question of a meeting of this kind. Such a meeting is merely a means of setting in motion *all* the forces of the working class, organized and unorganized. It is enough to take a look at the results of united action in France, which has already profoundly influenced the whole trend of politics in the Third Republic, and yet has not achieved everything that it might. True, it is more difficult to influence the policy of a fascist country than of a democratic country, but this circumstance should not lead us to reject action altogether, but, on the contrary, should make us double our efforts so as to influence the policy of the reactionary dictatorship.

Anyone who sneers at the united front does so in the interests of the bourgeoisie, the fascists, the war instigators. The position of the international bourgeoisie was considerably improved by what took place on the eve of the African war, when the working masses confidently awaited the establishment of the united front, which was rejected in Brussels, as a consequence of which their forces were demobilized. The bourgeoisie felt that the working class was still weak because they could still be prevented from establishing militant proletarian unity. From this time onwards the fascist war instigators raised their heads and began to operate with more confidence in all countries. What happened on the eve of the Italo-Ethiopian war is a horrible menace to

the working class. We will say quite frankly that the working class is faced with the menace of another August 4; and the danger is approaching from the same direction, namely, that of the reactionary wing of Social-Democracy. If the forces of the European working class are united, if the masses of the workers will fight together, then it will be possible to prevent war in Europe. But as long as the forces of the working class in Europe are scattered, and a big international organization like the Labor and Socialist International continues to subordinate itself to the Right leaders, who in turn are the lackeys of the bourgeoisie, the intrigues of the war instigators in Europe will continue to grow unhindered.

In the face of this serious danger, we consider it our duty to utter a serious warning, in addition, to those leaders of Social-Democracy who express great concern, in words, about the situation that has been created for the European proletariat, but who, in actual practice, do not at all help to further the success of international unity, either through the influence they enjoy, or by their activities. A typical example of this sort of leader is Otto Bauer. Before the advent of the fascists to power in Austria, Otto Bauer first and foremost tried at every stage to turn the workers from the road of effective mass struggle. But the articles he always wrote in this connection were very "Left" in form. With all these "Left" trappings, Austrian Social-Democracy nevertheless suffered a defeat, as a result of which Otto Bauer lost both his army and his prestige. Now he lays claim to teaching the proletariat of Europe at large, and writes articles still more "Left" than the previous ones. He talks in them of the need for unity. But in order to bring about unity, the resistance of the Rights must be broken down, and the line of fire directed against them in particular. Bauer actually, however, directs his line of fire against the Lefts, just as he tried, above all, before the February days, to smash the Austrian Communists and to isolate them, although they alone were pointing to the right road of struggle. In directing his fire against the Communist policy—the only policy which has been proved correct in actual practice—Otto Bauer is extending his hand to counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, to arch enemies of the united front and the U.S.S.R., the base agents of bourgeois counter-revolution, whose profession it is to disintegrate the working class movement.

What interpretation can we put upon Bauer's solemn and pathetic declarations in favor of unity, after all this? The world situation is shaping in such a way that the problem of defending the Soviet Union is becoming more and more acute. But can you prepare the working class to defend the Soviet Union against an onslaught by the fascists by spreading the foul calumny of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism among the Social-Democratic workers? And what can we say about the other leader of "Left" Social-Democracy, Paul Faure, who just at this moment refuses to see any difference between the alliances and secret agreements which the fascists make use of in preparation for war, and the international pacts concluded by the Soviet Union for the purpose of maintaining peace? Can it be denied that by writing such articles,

Paul Faure adds grist to the mill of the reactionaries who want to turn France away from the policy of peace, and to lead her into an adventure which will rapidly culminate in war?

We are sure that whatever happens, the cause of united action against war will be victorious, for the working class will be able to make its will manifest. But we would be evading our duty if we restricted ourselves merely to calling for unity, without conducting the most determined struggle among the working class to bring about this unity against all their enemies. The guarantee that unity will quickly be achieved lies in our struggle against the reactionary Right wing of Social-Democracy, and in our criticism of the inconsistency and vacillations of the Left elements.

* * *

The tactical problem in the anti-war struggle of the proletariat, which is second in importance to the problem of the international united front, is that of the attitude to be adopted to the activities of the League of Nations—the *problem of sanctions*.

The decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and the estimate of the international situation outlined above provide us with the key to the solution of this task. The Seventh Congress pointed out that in the struggle for peace, the proletariat should not refuse to attract temporary allies, even those that are not very reliable and who waver, and should make use of the contradictions which exist between the bourgeoisie of different countries. The Congress recognized that the League of Nations can to a certain extent serve as an obstacle to the realization of the plans of the war instigators. On the basis of this, as soon as the question of action by the League of Nations became a concrete one, the Comintern came to the conclusion that the proletariat should demand and support the application by the League of Nations of effective economic sanctions against the fascist aggressor. But at the same time the Comintern considers it wrong, first, to demand military sanctions, and, second, to restrict the anti-war activities of the proletariat to mere demands for sanctions and support for the sanctions applied by the League of Nations.

The demand for military sanctions would lead to the working class being towed along in the wake of British imperialism which is preparing for war against Italy under the pretext of "military sanctions".

The statesmen of the English bourgeoisie became converted to the League of Nations, and became ardent defenders of the full application of the statutes of the League of Nations, when they saw the possibility of using the League of Nations and its statutes as a weapon of imperialist policy against their Italian rivals. But we have not for a moment forgotten the past; we remember how British imperialism sabotaged the League of Nations and its statutes when it was in its interests to give Japan a free hand in Manchuria and to urge Germany on to restore its army on land, air and sea. Only blind and helpless democrats can think that the defense of peace can be furthered by British imperialists. But let bygones be bygones. Is it not the plan of the most reactionary section of the English bourgeoisie today to make use of the demand for

sanctions in order to strengthen their influence and undermine the position of France in the League of Nations with a view to preparing for a change in the whole of European politics in the direction of isolating the Soviet Union, by giving ever more determined support to the aggressive aspirations of National-Socialism? And ought we not to expect that after the recent parliamentary elections in England, the influence of this most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie will be felt still more in Europe?

Therefore if the proletariat were to limit themselves only to the demand that the League of Nations adopt economic sanctions, it would be a serious mistake, capable of undermining the revolutionary struggle against fascism and war. We reject such a line of tactics.

The experience of the last few months does not speak in favor of the League of Nations. It was shown that the possibility of the League of Nations taking action is extremely limited because there are deep-rooted differences of opinion inside the League of Nations itself, and chiefly, because with the exception of the Soviet Union, there is no group of states yet in Europe which will fight consistently to bring about a system of collective security.

Will such a group of powers be formed, and will it be able to create a system of collective security capable, at least, of postponing war, of prolonging the existing situation for a period of time? The fate of the League of Nations will most probably depend largely upon the answer to these questions. Moreover, this is of tremendous importance for the cause of peace. Therefore the working class must state their views on all these questions. But the working class will not be able to do so if the questions themselves remain hidden from them, thanks to the policy which forces them along in the wake of the League of Nations and British imperialism.

Thus, the revolutionary line must include support for the measures adopted by the League of Nations against the aggressor. But this question must occupy a subordinate position, while the central question must be that of independent action by the working class, the immediate struggle by the working class organizations directed towards isolating the fascist aggressors, towards making it impossible for them to continue war, and forcing them to cease military operations and restore peace. Only if independent action by the working class is made the central point can we count on success in compelling the bourgeoisie of different countries to refrain from intrigues which lead to war. Only in this way is it possible to influence the policy of the bourgeoisie in these countries and to stimulate them to participate in an effective system of collective security in Europe.

In each of the European countries, the main fire must be trained in a definite direction: in France—against the fascists and the policy of violating the obligations undertaken in the pact with the Soviet Union; in England—against support for the war plans of National-Socialism; in Czechoslovakia—against the intrigues of the reactionaries who are paving the way for the fascists and want to change the foreign policy of the country; in Germany and Austria—the aim must be to create a

mighty opposition of the people to fascism; in Italy—to defeat Mussolini in his criminal adventures, etc. But all that, in definite spheres, can and must be coordinated into one big struggle for peace, to be carried on by the *united* forces of the working class on a European scale.

Thus we return once more to the need for bringing about united action, *to the need for the united front on an international scale*. This question cannot be avoided, and we shall return to it again and again *until we are able to solve it. The fate of the struggle for peace depends upon this.*

* * *

Finally, and this is by no means of little importance, we must say that the work of the Communist vanguard of the working class has not yet risen to the heights of the tasks with which the struggle against war confronts us today.

First and foremost, the struggle against the Right wing of Social-Democracy which is sabotaging the united front has not been sufficiently developed among the working class or among the rank and file masses of the Social-Democratic workers. In consequence of this, the pressure upon the whole of Social-Democracy, with a view to forcing it to take the road of unity of action, has also been weak. Second, we have not made full use of the opportunities at our disposal of developing the independent struggle against war by the working class and broad masses of the toilers. We must draw the attention of all our comrades to these two points.

Eight days before the outbreak of military operations, Comrade Dimitroff, on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, made a proposal to the Labor and Socialist International that the question be discussed of the best way of applying the measures worked out by both Internationals in defense of peace.

We expected in view of the fact that the situation was a serious one, demanding most rapid and determined action, that the Labor and Socialist International would overcome all prejudices and obstacles, and break down the resistance of the reactionary Right wing, and would accept the proposal made by Comrade Dimitroff. We considered the acceptance of this proposal to be of the greatest importance. But we never have thought that our struggle against war should be limited to merely sending a proposal to the Labor and Socialist International, and that the acceptance of this proposal is an essential condition for the development of an independent struggle by our Parties in defense of peace. The independent action by our Parties and the struggle for the united front do not contradict each other. They supplement and consolidate each other. It is chiefly thanks to our independent struggle against fascism, and to the successes of this struggle, that we have been able to bring the pressure to bear upon a number of parties in the Labor and Socialist International, which has forced them to choose the road of unity of action. A refusal to undertake mass action against war or to restrict this struggle because the Labor and Socialist International returned an answer in the negative, would be one of the most inconsistent things to do, and one of the most serious mistakes to make. On

the contrary, we should take as our basis the fact that in spite of the decisions forced upon them by the Right leaders, the number of Social-Democratic workers prepared to fight against war is considerable and continues to grow, and we must find means of carrying on the struggle together with them. On the other hand, in many countries the forces which support our parties are already of a mass character. We can muster these forces around our own slogans, and by doing so, very broad sections of the masses can be brought into the struggle.

This is why the manifesto against the war in Ethiopia, issued by the Executive Committee of the Comintern when the Labor and Socialist International dallied with their answer to the proposals made by Comrade Dimitroff, says quite openly that we must begin to organize a mighty movement of all *toilers* against the war. In this manifesto the Communist International openly appeals to the Socialist workers, and to all their organizations and parties, to leave aside all differences in opinions and to act together against the fascist war instigators.

Obviously, we considered it essential, and could not do otherwise, that our struggle for united action with the Labor and Socialist International should be accompanied by independent anti-war action on the part of the Communist vanguard, and that these actions should be sufficiently energetic to win the support of wide masses of workers of all political currents, and to exert a strong effect upon the situation. The struggle against war was started by our parties, but it was not sufficiently energetic and systematic, and at the decisive moment it almost came to nothing. We must now make up for lost time. We must set to work with all our energies, in all countries and on all fronts—*and first and foremost among the workers organized in the trade unions, so as to isolate the fascist aggressor by stopping all cargoes destined for fascist Italy and her colonies, and by mobilizing the working class and the whole of public opinion in general on as broad a scale as possible and in every possible form, against Italian fascism, against the war intrigues of National-Socialism, and against Japanese aggression in China.*

We want to remind all our comrades and all revolutionary workers, that resolutions were adopted at the Seventh Congress which are being justified by events every day, and which are of historic importance. But this alone is not enough. Unless the Communist vanguard carry on a stubborn and persistent struggle these resolutions will not be carried out and the great cause of united action against fascism and war will not meet with the successes it should, and meet with them as *quickly* as the growing danger of world imperialist war demands.