

# THE Communist

An Organ of the Third (Communist) International

(PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN)

No. 103

SATURDAY, JULY 22nd, 1922.

[Registered at the G.P.O.  
as a Newspaper]

TWOPENCE

## The Communist Party and the Labour Party

THIS SPECIAL NUMBER is devoted to questions at issue between the Communist Party and the Labour Party.

We do not take the Edinburgh decisions as final. We are continuing the fight and our reasons are given in the official articles herein.

It is not the Communist Party, but the middle-class theoreticians (Fabians and I.L.P.) who are splitting the Labour movement.

It is these dictators who in the name of "democracy" seek to destroy the right of the rank and file to move in a revolutionary direction.

It is these theoreticians who at Edinburgh demonstrated alike their anxiety for the approval of the reactionary middle-class elector and their hatred for the revolutionary left wing of the working-class movement.

It is these who as the Communist Party grows stronger grow ever more bitter in their hostility to the Communist Party's claim to affiliation.

And it is these—the Sidney Webbs, the Ethel Snowdens and the Macdonalds—who with Frank Hodges as their enthusiastic ally are straining every nerve to secure an "industrial peace" with the ruling class and a political truce with the middle class.

The reason why the rank and file of the Trade Unions should be on their guard and should back the Communist Party in its struggle is set out herein. The Communist has no ends to serve other than those of the working-class.

Let the Workers rally to the side of the Communist Party.

## Who is Splitting the Labour Movement?

OF all the indictments that can be brought against a political party, the accusation that it is splitting the Labour Movement is the most damaging. It is a grave accusation at any time. If made at the present moment it is doubly damning—if it can be proved.

That accusation is now being made against the Communist Party by some Labour Party speakers, by the "old gang" of I.L.P. officials such as Ramsay Macdonald, and by a certain number of Trade Union leaders.

It is, therefore, our business to examine this accusation, to discover whether it has any basis as made against the Communist Party, and, what is equally important, to discover whether the accusation would have any basis if made against the accusers themselves. In this way we may find an answer to the question at the head of this article.

It is clear that the movement is being split. The authors of that split may turn out to dwell in unexpected quarters.

The first point to dispose of is the absurd suggestion that the Communists in being expelled from the Labour Party were in some way splitting the Labour Movement. This charge is so absurd, so completely the reverse of the facts that those who make it can only do so in order to divert attention from their own little efforts at splitting the movement. The only splitting that has happened so far is the attempt made by the Fabians and I.L.P.ers and other panjandrums of the Labour Party Executive to split off from the Labour Movement the section of the working class which follows the lead of the Communist Party. In order to carry through this split they were not content to have their August, 1920 rejection of the Communist Party's affiliation confirmed: they insisted on preventing any trade union or any district of any trade unions or any branch of any trade union, from sending as its delegate to a local Labour Party or to the National Labour Party Conference anyone who was not to their liking. This was aimed at excluding all Communists. And it was so far a clever move that it compels the Communist Party to alter its tactics. But the fact that this attempted exclusion of the Communists will not be successful does not absolve the Fabians and leading I.L.P.ers from their attempt to split the working class movement, and to expel all local Labour Parties and trade unions which would dare to put forward delegates with opinions other than those now in favour with the Eccleston Square junta.

The second point to dispose of is the current accusation that the Communists are out to split the trade unions. This lie proceeds out of the mouths of officials whose conduct of trade union affairs has been so disastrous during the last eighteen months that if any actions of a leader could split a union, their actions most assuredly would have done.

When the Communists try to introduce some sanity and courage into the conduct of union affairs, these officials resent

the implied (and often expressed) criticisms of their leadership as a sort of treason to the union itself. They cry out "The Communists are out to split the unions"; and under cover of that cry they will attempt to expel the one element which keeps up a spirit of fight in the broken ranks of the proletariat.

There is something sublime in the impudence with which high-placed trade union officials, and particularly parliamentarians, "hard-faced men who have done well out of the war,"\* callously bring the charge of "splitting the Labour Movement," against men who have sacrificed everything, have been batoned by police, been sentenced to long imprisonments, and been thrown out of job after job and finally black-listed for the sake of that Labour Movement which they are now accused of splitting.

Let us now go a little deeper, beyond the panic-stricken legislation of the Edinburgh Conference, and examine the meaning of the phrase "splitting the Labour Movement": and, first of all, let us ask when the splitting of the united movement first began. The Labour Movement reached its highest expression of formal organisation in the International, as it had grown from 1889 up to 1914. That International had as one of its main objects the prosecution of the class struggle and the struggle against imperialist wars. When the war broke out, the International was rent from top to bottom. Scheidemann and Ebert in Germany, Renaudel, Guesde, Thomas in France, Plekhanoff in Russia, Vandervelde in Belgium, all retired from the International stage on which they had been strutting and proceeded to put on the garb of everyday support of their Governments. So it was too in this country. The chief Fabians, the chief parliamentary members, all forsook the International. Some of the latter, such as Henderson, Hodge, Barnes, Brace, and Roberts, actually joined the Government, which was the chief support of that "capitalist domination" which they had bound themselves to subvert.

Clynes, Barnes, and other leading members of the I.L.P. went over also. Macdonald equivocated. So did Bernard Shaw.

Almost alone amongst the well-known figures of the International Labour Movement, Keir Hardie and Robert Smillie stood out against the war, against the splitting and for the unity of the Labour Movement.

Unqualified in its glee, the *Times*, the representative organ of capitalism as a whole, began an editorial on "War and Class War," by showing how the one thing dreaded by the governments of Europe, the refusal of the working class to break its

\*And did they not do well out of the war? Exempted from military service, consulted by the heads of the State, given position and prestige for their repression of "unofficial" strikes, "sworn of His Majesty's most honourable Privy Council," and, not least, raised in their salaries from the contributions of members who are now near starvation. Who can deny that they did well out of the war?

## WHO IS SPLITTING THE LABOUR MOVEMENT? (continued)

solidarity by engaging in a war of brother against brother, had proved an empty threat. Who was it that enabled the *Times* to rejoice? Who was it that had split the Labour Movement?

In his pamphlet called the "Collapse of the Second International," and written in 1915, Comrade Lenin shows very clearly that this spectacular splitting of the Labour Movement in August, 1914, by Henderson, Hyndman, Webb, Clynes and their like in every land, had been prepared for a long time before by a series of surrenders to the bourgeoisie, by ignoble and, what is worse, unnecessary compromises with capitalism, by the adoption of capitalist—particularly Liberal-capitalist—ideas and programmes and the rejection of Socialist ideas and programmes, by the denial of the class struggle and by the affirmation of social peace.

Since the end of the war the same tendencies have shown themselves, not less, but more. It was impossible ever to betray the working class on a large scale as they did eight years ago; but everything that could be done on a smaller scale has been attempted. When, after the war, during the boom, the workers of Europe were ready to advance against the capitalists it was the leaders of the Second International who counselled them to be moderate, to be patient, to give the capitalist a chance. By so doing they split the Labour Movement, and even, in some cases, remained in the ranks of the bourgeoisie whom they had joined "for the duration." Examples of this are G. N. Barnes, G. H. Roberts, and William Brace.

When, after the boom was past, tens of thousands of workers were added each week to the number of unemployed, and the employers began their offensive against the working class, there was a chance to unite the whole Labour Movement in a defensive warfare. Throughout the proletariat there was a feeling that this pomp and panoply of trade unionism, with its leaders all in shining armour, might prove the means of saving them from want, from poverty, disease and degradation, from "selling-up" and tramping the streets, from the heart-breaking search for work. Had the leaders been willing to move, the masses would

have moved behind them. What actually happened? The answer to that question is too well known. The answer is "Black Friday." And not one Black Friday but many. By those betrayals the Labour Movement has been split, not in a formal sense of one organisation living off from another and starting on its own; but split almost irreparably, split and rent and broken in spirit, in courage, in the sense of solidarity and common class interests that are the only foundation of unity.

Against this progressive disruption of trade union forces, against the disintegrating lack of spirit that turns a retreat into a rout, and makes the Labour Movement the movement of the organised proletariat, into a mere mob of wage-slaves, fleeing from destruction and trampling one another down in their panic, against this there has been working, however brokenly and with whatever difficulty, one steady influence.

That influence has stood for putting up a fight instead of tame submission; for something constructive amid the destructiveness of cynicism, rot, and decay; for the belief in the essential unity of the proletariat against the endeavours to gain sectional advantages at the expense of others; for the slogans of the class struggle against the defeatist counsels of "Industrial Parliaments," "Ten Years' Truce," and the underhand bargains of the parliamentary politicians; for courage and faith, instead of cowardice and despair, in a word, for unity.

That influence, as influences the Communist Party, has stood, almost alone, for the fighting unity of the Labour Movement. It is left for those who have split and rent the Labour Movement of this country to finish their work of destruction by an attempt to sabotage the hope of revival with the cry that "The Communists are splitting the Movement." In that last attempt they will be defeated.

For the destiny of the Labour Movement is not disintegration and submission: but solidarity and triumph. And the party that stands for its solidarity, will be the party to lead it to triumph.

## DEMOCRATS AND DICTATORSHIP

**T**O understand the bitter opposition of certain I.L.P. leaders against Communist affiliation to the Labour Party it is necessary to remember the circumstances under which the Labour Party developed.

About the year 1900, the Labour Representation Committee, which afterwards changed its name to that of the Labour Party, was formed as a direct result of the Trade Unions being forced into active politics. The Taff Vale judgment had rendered Trade Unions liable to heavy damages in the event of strikes, and a strong movement was set on foot to get the law altered.

Here was a golden opportunity for an ambitious politician to make history. The Trade Unions had ample funds, and a prestige among the workers which the I.L.P. leaders at that time certainly did not possess.

If this industrially organised mass of workers could be manoeuvred under the political leadership of a man of genius, what magnificent possibilities lay in the future. The Socialist Die-Hards, with their crazy insistence on dogmatic Marxism and the class-war, stood no earthly chance; but a young intellectual with a fine voice, some political insight, and the gifts of a born orator had every reason to hope.

On this Trade Union movement, thus forced by circumstances into politics, Ramsay Macdonald managed to impose himself as the supreme politician. He had not grown out of the movement; he had no particular sympathy with the working-class struggle; he certainly did not believe in the existence of a class war. His political ideals, when they were not Utopian, were simply pacifist Liberal. But Socialism as a phrase had become popular ("We are all Socialists now," said Sir William Harcourt about this time), and he could with perfect safety adopt the fashionable cult, or even obtain some advantage by a reputation for being a devil of an agitator—within strict limits.

As it noted that his influence has never extended beyond the official ring of the Trade Unions. Among the rank-and-file he is a name and no more. But his domination over a Labour Party Conference is undeniable.

The Executive and official Trade Union mind so largely represented at these Conferences has no time for excursions into the intricacies of politics, and is notoriously unimaginative. It puts out its political thinking, as, individually, it puts out its washing. By a clever manipulating of Labour Party Conferences and Trade Union Executives a few men determine the political development of the working-class movement, without in any way representing the class itself, or, indeed, being in touch with it at all.

*But they control the machine.*

This, in their own jargon, is democracy as opposed to dictatorship.

On international affairs their attitude is very much the same. They are the apostles of pure democracy as represented by the Second International.

Because the Communists, as they put it, "take their orders from Moscow," they must be hounded out of the British working-class movement. Because the Third International endeavours to co-ordinate the working-class movement in all lands it is infringing the sacred right of each national democracy to do what it pleases irrespective of the interests of the whole.

But what is an International for, but to act internationally? The failure to act up to this cardinal principle damned the Second International in the years of the Great War. Without a common centre and a common policy there is no International.

The opposition to the Communists on the ground of dictatorship is not sincere.

When Frank Hodges, for instance, at Edinburgh, spoke of "giving always the best expression of the will of every member

in the nation," as the aim of democracy, he was advocating something which in the first place is impossible; and, in the second, is carried out in so far as it can be carried out, just as much by the Communists of Russia as by the Labour Party democrats of Great Britain.

That fateful meeting at the House of Commons addressed by Frank Hodges just previous to Black Friday was the immediate cause of a debacle which is having tragic consequences on the lives of millions of workers in reductions of wages and general deterioration of life. These millions were certainly never consulted on the matter, and to say their will was expressed is more even than Mr. Hodges dare venture.

The sneer concerning "The Asiatic Mind" was singularly ungracious and not even original. Long ago it was worn thin in the columns of the *Morning Post*.

When the starving Russian workers sent splendid assistance to the locked-out British miners last year we do not remember any reference to the "Asiatic Mind" in the acknowledgment that was sent by Mr. Hodges.

Like the rest of the I.L.P. Leaders who denounce Communists because we do not accept "parliamentary political democracy" as the last word in political development, Mr. Hodges, despite his industrial associations, belongs essentially to the parliamentary type. One cannot imagine Robert Smillie or Herbert Smith basing an argument against Communism on "The Asiatic Mind," or branding Communists as "the intellectual slaves of Moscow." Yet these men certainly represent the rough life of the worker and his mental outlook far more adequately than either Frank Hodges or Ramsay Macdonald.

We are charged too with seeking to enter the Labour Party in order to destroy it. But no evidence has ever been advanced to prove that we have ever attacked the Party as such, and certainly not its working-class components. On the contrary, now as ever, we are anxious to make the Labour Party a real living expression of industrial needs.

That we have criticised leaders and policy we cheerfully admit. That we should continue to advocate our own policy if admitted to the Labour Party, we do not deny. Surely, dictatorship consists in refusing us the right.

Nor, although we criticise the tactics of some I.L.P. leaders and their influence on Labour Party Conferences, have we any quarrel with the rank-and-file of the I.L.P. We know that in the mass they are at one with us in their desire to end as quickly as possible the squalid existence of capitalism. We know that in any grave crisis they would be found side by side with us, fighting a common battle. We fear only that the working-class may be side-tracked into some by-path of capitalist politics.

Even Mr. Ramsay Macdonald himself is not so hidebound an adherent to the tenets of "pure democracy" as his utterances at Edinburgh would imply.

He writes, for instance, in the current number of *Forward*:—

"At Nottingham, the I.L.P. went in for some red tape of democracy and settled that only members of the N.A.C. and one member elected from each division should compose our team at Labour Party Conferences."

Woe unto Democracy when it puts red tape into the place of spirit, or when it wears a uniform for-appearance sake which trips it up."

On the whole, that last paragraph is not a bad criticism of a decision which debars, in the name of Democracy, the Communists from contributing their quota to the discussions of the organised working class.

# Why the Labour Party Fears the COMMUNIST PARTY

**A**FTER Edinburgh it is clear that those who dictate the policy of the Labour Party literally *fear* the entry of the Communist Party

Why is this?

It is not really because those who lead the leaders of the Labour Party are concerned lest the working-class should be led into desperate adventures—although they would pretend so much.

It is not this, because the Communist Party can only exercise its influence through direct contact with the rank-and-file who are never likely to be moved into mass action unless their interests are vitally affected.

It is in reality because the Communist Party is a challenge to the foundation upon which the whole of the Fabian and Right Wing I.L.P. influence rests. Under the present constitution and with the block vote system, these leader-leaders can secure their ends by their personal drawing-room influence upon a Thomas, a Clynes, or a Henderson. They can thus dispose of the "will" and votes of millions of the rank-and-file. And they fear the Communist Party because they desire to exercise this influence in a way which needs the absence of any of that downright working-class criticism that would reveal the true inwardness of their drive to the Right.

The crisis at which capitalist society has arrived admits of only two conceivable solutions—either a new-Bureaucratic-Feudalised State Capitalism in which the workingmass are finally allotted to a servile status from which neither they nor their posterity can ever hope to escape, or, the reverse of this, a workers' Soviet Republic.

Just because capitalism has arrived at a crisis—just because the workingclass have triumphed politically in Russia and need but the extension of that political triumph to Western Europe to enable it to find expression in economic reconstruction—just because the *possibility* of a working-class revolution is ever before them, these middle-class theoreticians hate and fear the Communist Party.

The official heads of the great trade unions who figure before the public as the Labour Party's leaders, fear the Communist Party for another reason.

Their whole lives have been spent in a conscientious concern for the funds of the great trade union combinations at whose head they stand and in whose service they have gained public notoriety and political consideration.

Too busy to do other than take their social speculations at second-hand; too cautious from professional preoccupations to favour other than timid and "safe" policies; too old to sympathise with new ideas; and too steeped in routine to have patience for other than routine procedure, the trade union leaders form tools ready-made for the hands of the middle-class theoreticians.

To them the Communist Party comes as an aggravation of their worst perplexities. Where they would counsel delay and diplomatic negotiations the Communist Party will organise the elements clamouring for action.

Always their fear is, these great trade union chiefs, that they will be drawn into some crisis in which they must dare everything on the side of the working-class and so lose (in a cause their habitual and acquired political concepts make it impossible for them to understand) all the respect and adulation from high

places which has come to them as "safe" and "sane" leaders of Labour.

Thoroughly filled with a respect for the superiority of the middle-class into which they have risen by virtue of their official importance, morbidly sensitive to middle-class criticism because of a morbid recollection of their proletarian origin—which they hate to remember but for their trades' sake dare not forget—the trade union leaders see in the Communist Party the acid test which will reveal with brutal thoroughness upon which side they stand in the irrepressible and ever intensifying class struggle, whose existence they would be glad to deny and yet whose realities give them whatever standing they have.

The middle-class theoretician hates the Communist Party because of its superior attraction to the working mass.

The trade union leader hates the Communist Party because he has grown so used to intellectual reliance upon the middle-class that any challenge to *their* ideology leaves him floundering in painful consciousness of his own isolation and insufficiency.

Both together hate the Communist Party because its coming into the Labour Party would force upon it the need for action:—the middle-class theoreticians because the action would destroy their theories, the trade union leaders because it is action at all and not the "diplomatic" compromise which is to them the beginning and end of all wisdom.

With the rank-and-file it is different.

The miners remember that it was the Communists whom the Government imprisoned during the lock-out last year.

The engineers know the Communists were, during the recent lock-out, untiring in their efforts to strengthen the fighting front.

And the unemployed know who have fought reactionary Boards of Guardians and who have made the unemployed an integral part of the Labour movement instead of allowing them to drift and degenerate.

They know that, before the coming of the Communist Party, the unemployed were left to sink into a despairing mass, ready to be used by the employers as a weapon against those at work or those who threatened to come out on strike.

The established leaders of the Labour Party are afraid of any band of determined fighters for the masses entering the organisation—because this handful of middle-class intellectuals who control the Party and manipulate the Conferences, have been able to demonstrate, to the capitalist political parties, that their organisation is not out to fight upon *working-class* issues. They contend that the Labour Party is not a *class* organisation; has not been, as Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald is never tired of repeating, an anti-capitalist Party. Were the Communists permitted to enter the Labour Party things would be different. They would seize every opportunity of rousing the workers to oppose capitalism and to use every political crisis to force the Labour Party and the leaders to give a *class* lead against the propertied interests.

Among the slanders advanced as reasons the Communists should not be admitted into the Labour Party, there was one lie which not even a Hodges or Macdonald dared utter—and that was that the Communist Party had ever refused to fight for the working class or had ever betrayed the masses! Even the closing phrase of Hodges' scurrilous attack upon the Communists was a plea that they would not desert the workers. That appeal replied to and destroyed every argument that had been advanced against admitting the Communists into what is called the *Labour* Party.

## "JUSTICE"—AND "A FAIR TRIAL" The Social Revolutionaries

**A**FTER the Resolution condemning the Soviet Government at Edinburgh had been passed by an overwhelming majority, those who had voted drifted out to the corridor and commenced asking one another what it was all about.

Why was the resolution sprung on the Conference without the usual procedure of first supplying the delegates with copies?

It couldn't be for lack of time. Macdonald and Henderson knew about the trial of the Social-Revolutionaries and the Vandervelde incident a week before the Conference met.

Why wasn't the resolution submitted to the arrangements committee, as all other resolutions had to be submitted?

The arrangements committee might have included one man who understood the situation, and *that* would have been embarrassing to the plans of those who were determined to mislead the Conference.

*For the Conference was misled.*

In the name of democracy and justice the Conference was led into an unpardonable attack on the Soviet Government, just when the Hague Conference was in its opening stages.

Isn't there something seriously wrong somewhere when we find a Conference of working-class delegates lining up with French and Belgian financiers against the Workers' Government of Russia?

It is a crime against the working-class. All else at the Conference was of little moment beside this act of treachery.

The Imperialist Governments of Europe, after failing to crush Russia with armed hirelings and counter-revolutionaries, are now

trying to force the harshest possible terms on it, as a condition for arranging credits.

France and Belgium are insisting on the return of Private Property to those who owned it prior to the Revolution. This was the most important issue at the Hague.

The workers of this country ought to be alive to it, but they are not.

The Labour Party Conference ought to have passed a resolution urging the Soviet Government to remain firm and never under any circumstances to allow its internal policy to be interfered with by the property-mongering capitalists of Europe, and pledging its whole-hearted support to it through the fight.

Surely the rank-and-file of the I.L.P. is with the Soviet Government in its fight for existence?

Yet it was a leader of the I.L.P. (Macdonald) and his colleague of the Second International (Henderson—a deadly enemy of the I.L.P.) who were responsible for the attack being made on Russia.

\* \* \*

What a pretext! *A fair trial for the Social Revolutionaries*, and without any trial at all the Conference was wangled into giving a verdict of guilty against the Soviet Government.

Ask your delegate to the Conference to tell you who the Social-Revolutionaries are.

Ask him to tell you what all the trouble is about.

Ask your trade union leader the same question, and you will find they know very little about the matter—that their knowledge is of the haziest.

## "JUSTICE"—AND "A FAIR TRIAL" (continued)

The Social-Revolutionaries, it was stated at the Conference, were the Socialists of Russia and were being persecuted for their political opinions.

A deliberate lie!

Macdonald knows it is not true, so also does Henderson, but these gentlemen, having prepared the stage, let their tools do the work, and themselves said nothing.

You who are of the I.L.P., ask Macdonald if they are the Socialists of Russia, and if they are being persecuted for political opinions.

Get him to put his answer down in writing, then he can be dealt with.

\* \* \*

The S.R.'s are not Socialists. Odd members may be Socialist, or anarchist, or anything, but it is not a Socialist organisation.

The S.R.'s were organised to fight the Tsarist Government and they did so with the bomb and the bullet. They believed in and practised propaganda by deed. Assassination of political opponents was their method of overthrowing the government.

The Bolsheviks always opposed these methods—regarding them as being hopelessly abortive. They placed their hopes in organisation of the workers as the one sure method of ending Tsarism and Capitalism.

When the Bolshevik Government, supported by the masses, took over control, Russia was in ruins. Transport had broken down, industries were idle; chaos was everywhere.

Only a firm hand could restore order and save the Revolution.

The Bolshevik Government was equal to the task, but in its work it met with the bitter opposition of the S.R.'s. This opposition was repressed as it had been expressed against the Tsarist Government.

A deliberate and cold-blooded policy of assassination of Bolshevik Commissars was developed by the Central Committee and members of the Party were told off to do the work.

Uritsky fell a victim to the S.R.'s, Volodarsky followed, Lenin had two poisoned bullets shot into him, and only his wonderful recuperative powers saved him for the revolution.

And this is what Cramp and Webb call "merely expressing political opinions."

More than that. The Central Committee of Social-Revolutionaries has been associated with every counter-revolutionary attack on the Soviet Government—Koltchak, Denikin, Yudenitch and Wrangel.

Not for political opinions but for *murder* and complicity with counter-revolution the S.R.'s are being tried.

Yet Macdonald and Henderson (the ultra-constitutionalists) associate themselves with these self-confessed "physical forcists," *not because they sympathise with them, but simply because it gives an opportunity of attacking the Soviet Government.*

Vandervelde was allowed into Russia to defend the prisoners. The Second International sent him.

Vandervelde threw up the case—and the reason given us is that the Communist Government put difficulties in his way. A weak excuse and false on the face of it.

Just think it over. Vandervelde was sent in to assist the prisoners. If his story is true that the position was difficult for him.

how much more difficult must it have been for the Russian counsel who were defending and for the prisoners themselves?

If it had been true that the Government was making things difficult, that would have been only the more reason for a brave man to stay.

\* \* \*

Vandervelde deserted the prisoners in the most cowardly fashion, because their defence wasn't going to redound to the credit of the Second International. Vandervelde, if the story Macdonald is telling is true, is a miserable coward and poltroon.

But it isn't true.

Vandervelde is the tool of the Belgian Government. One of King Albert's loyal ministers. The Belgian Government is controlled by the French and American financiers and faithfully responds to their every desire.

Vandervelde is the moving spirit in the Second International. The wonderful Macdonald is but a puppet in his hands, and dances accordingly as Vandervelde pulls the strings.

\* \* \*

Henderson, Sidney Webb and the Second International, blinded by their hatred of the Bolsheviks, can be easily led when it is a question of attacking the latter. This explains the resolution condemning the Soviet Government.

Not sympathy for the S.R.'s. None of these so-called Labour Leaders care a snap of the fingers for these men who are at present undergoing trial.

It was an opportunity for these "bourgeoisie monarchists" to express their hatred of a working-class heroically struggling to be free.

It showed these Labour Leaders to be the faithful allies of Lloyd George, Poincare, and King Albert.

But worst of all it showed how easy the working-class delegates to a Labour Party Conference could be misled.

We must overcome this or the working-class movement is doomed.

We must get rid of the political touts who are playing the Labour Party into the hands of Capitalism.

The Hendersons, Macdonalds and Webbs must go, if the Labour Movement is to be saved.

# Communist Party of Great Britain

16, KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT

These Pamphlets were specially written to reach the workers  
FOR MINERS

## The Doom of a Coalfield

By J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD.

The past, present, and future of South Wales. With a moral for every other coalfield in Great Britain.

Price, 1d. Per doz., 11d., post free. Per 100, 6s. 6d., carriage paid.

## A Straight Talk to Miners

A Communist message to a sweated industry. Capitalism in this country was built up on coal. The capitalists hope to renew their lease of life by means of the squalid misery of starving miners.

Price, 1d. Per doz., 11d., post free. Per 100, 6s. 6d., carriage paid.

FOR WOMEN

## To Working Women!

By Y. J.

An excellent propaganda pamphlet. Simply written in telling phrases. Suitable for Women's Guilds.

Price, 1d. Per doz., 11d., post free. Per 100, 6s. 6d., carriage paid.

FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

## The Land Grabbers

A RECORD OF ROBBERY

By FRANK TANNER.

Although written for land workers, this pamphlet has an appeal for town workers also. Specially interesting to those who would understand history from the working-class standpoint.

Price 2d. Per doz., 1s. 9d., post free. Per 100, 12s., carriage paid.

JUST OUT

## Parliamentary Policy AND AN ELECTORAL PROGRAMME

Uniform with the pamphlet on "Industrial Policy."

The Communist position on matters that are likely to be discussed at the General Election.

A lead to all constituencies.

Price, 1d. Per doz., 11d., post free. Per 100, 6s. 6d., carriage paid.

NOW READY

## Volume 2 of Communist Review

Bound in dark green cloth, gold lettering. Indexed according to subjects and authors.

Price, 5s.

Post free, 5s. 9d.



# The Labour Party and the Soviet Government

ON June 28th, the Labour Party Conference at Edinburgh passed a resolution on the motion of C. T. Cramp, backed by Sidney Webb, Jack Jones, Bevin, and Brownlie, on the subject of the Socialist Revolutionaries now on trial in Moscow.

The text is worth while considering: it throws a blaze of light upon the reasons why the present leaders of the Labour Party are so bitter against the Soviet Government and the Communist Party.

"This Conference condemns," the resolution runs, "the harsh and unjust treatment of the Russian S.R. prisoners by the Government of Russia."

What is the record of the Socialist Revolutionaries? One of the blackest treachery to the Russian working class. Let us overlook their attempts to murder Lenin and their assassinations of Soviet leaders; their wrecking of railways and grain stores when the Russian towns were starving; their sabotage of every public service, not excluding education and sanitation.

But what are the British organised workers to say of men who received money from the French and British militarists, from Churchill and Noulens, to spread desolation and slaughter in Russia just at the moment when British workers were struggling to stop intervention?

What are we to think of those "Socialists" who were—and still are—hand-in-glove with every white monarchist general, helping with their propaganda abroad, supplying them with military information from within, and openly declaring that they preferred to see the Russian Tsardom restored sooner than accept the Soviet Government? All this is openly admitted by the Socialist Revolutionaries now on trial, and has long been a matter of common knowledge in the Labour movement.

"Harsh and unjust treatment!" For two years these men have had their lives spared, they have been given every comfort in prison—papers, a co-operative store, a voice in prison management, visits from the greatest artistes of the State theatres and ballet (ask Albert Inkpin and the 11,000 Rand strikers what they think of such inhuman conditions). And now, because the evidence on hand makes it possible to reconstruct a full picture of their activities, we are to treat them as innocent martyrs.

## "Scandalous"

"It regards the manner in which their trials have been conducted as nothing short of scandalous." Where did those who framed this resolution find out how the trial is being conducted? Not more than a dozen paragraphs in all have appeared in the *Herald* on the subject. Did they get their information from the capitalist Press; and is it not our bitter experience that the bought papers of the ruling class cannot open their mouths without dropping out a lie about Soviet Russia? It would be interesting to ask every delegate to the Conference what he knows about the trial. True, the continental Socialist press has published full reports of the proceedings, which the I.L.P. section of the Labour Party Executive probably studied; but why were they not made available for the rank-and-file? Because they would have revealed the incontrovertible fact that the accused have been treated better than probably anyone else in their position in the whole of world history. They have been allowed legal defence from amongst their political sympathisers abroad, including a Cabinet Minister; better treatment than Jim Connolly or Gandhi received. They have been allowed full freedom to consult with their counsel, Russian and foreign; indeed, Vandervelde in his organ at home (*Le Peuple*) has placed on record that he has never yet seen a high treason and rebellion trial in which the accused were in a position to invite their defenders to dinner! They have been allowed to behave throughout as though they were at a political meeting rather than a trial for treason, each of them making inordinately long speeches of several hours' duration, examining witnesses on the most irrelevant details to their heart's content, and scarcely a word of remonstrance from the chairman! Of course, Vandervelde did not like the countless resolutions that poured in from every factory, village, township, throughout Russia; and very likely he thinks it scandalous, and that the Russian workers and peasants by rights should all be summoned for contempt of court. But M. Vandervelde has not passed four years of starvation, cold, disease, and desperate fighting, all thanks in no small measure to the Socialist-Revolutionaries, like the Russian proletariat; M. Vandervelde was snug and warm in his study. . . .

"The execution of any of these comrades would be an outrage to the working-class sense of justice." Comrades! The associates of Kolchak, Denikin, the Polish landlords, the Finnish White Guards, the bosom friends of the French Foreign Office, the admitted intimates of Whitehall—comrades! Whose comrades? Comrades of the rank-and-file trade unionists, whose fellow-unionists the Socialist-Revolutionaries shot by the score in Samara, Yaroslavl, Omsk, Rostoff, Ufa, Vladivostok, and Tamboff, and dozens of other places, merely because they were

trade unionists, and trade union membership was a crime under the White rule? Comrades—of the British workers who rose like one man in August, 1920, and, in their Councils of Action, demanded that British Government support be immediately withdrawn from the bloody White generals whose mainstay—on their own boastful showing—these "Socialist-Revolutionaries" were? Or, if they are not their comrades, are they the comrades of the gang that put this lie into the mouth of the British working-class? If so, who are they? The British workers have for three years been demanding peace and recognition of Soviet Russia; who are the men who, claiming to be leaders, address Soviet Russia's most savage and ruthless enemies as "comrades?"

If there is any doubt about what the Russian workers themselves think—and surely their opinion is worth taking before we accept the Socialist-Revolutionaries as comrades—we challenge the leaders of the Labour Party to publish in the *Herald* an unbiased eye-witness' account of the gigantic demonstration of the Moscow workers, fully half a million strong, that poured ceaselessly through the streets of June 20, to commemorate the murder of young Volodarsky, at Party orders, by a Socialist-Revolutionary.

What is the explanation of all this? Why is it that a Labour Conference should be induced to call men comrades who boast of their alliance with White Guards? Why is it that C. T. Cramp should be led, in moving the resolution, to explain that all he wanted was a fair trial for the accused; when the accused have literally been as little restrained in their defence as if they were in a debating society? Why is it that Jack Jones, that veteran working-class warrior, should be led to utter arrant nonsense about "the men on trial having fought Tsardom and terrorism while many of their persecutors to-day were hidden abroad"? This about the cowardly gang who ordered one of their members to shoot Lenin and publicly disclaimed the deed the next day; men who dared not voice their opinions in the Soviets and the trade unions because the organised workers were against them, and fled instead to France, England and Germany to beg for foreign intervention; men who, at their very trial to-day, are twisting and turning and being detected every session in their attempts to evade responsibility for this or that act! And who told Jack Jones that the Bolsheviks sought refuge abroad as a Party? Why is it Ernest Bevin has been led to compare these self-accused gunmen and bomb-throwers, who strove to overthrow a working-class Republic which he attempted to defend by preventing the export of munitions to the Socialist-Revolutionaries, with Tom Mooney, falsely accused of attempting to murder officials of the capitalist State?

## A First-Class Political Swindle

Why? Because the whole affair is a gigantic "stunt," rushed upon the British workers without any attempt to acquaint them with the facts. The loyalty of the proletariat to its leaders has been deliberately taken advantage of to create a stampede, although no hard, concrete facts were produced at any stage to justify such a move. Sidney Webb let the cat out of the bag, and at the same time paid the Soviet Government the highest compliment for which he could wish: "It is peculiarly susceptible to the expression of working-class opinion in other countries." And so Sidney Webb, and those of his colleagues who have made up their minds that at all costs the Communists must be hounded out of the Labour movement, decided that a deliberate deception practised upon millions of British workers (including many trade union leaders and spokesmen) was not too high a price to pay for the great advantage of getting in a blow at Soviet Russia and thereby creating an atmosphere unfavourable to the Communists' case. That was worth all the trouble of a first-class political swindle. And it is not going to stop there. Already in the *Herald* of July 12, we find a demand that the Soviet Government spare the lives of the criminal priests who incited and led violent resistance to the church treasure appropriation committees, causing the deaths of innocent people—and this, be it noted, in 1922, not 1918, not in a period of civil war, but at a time when they were perfectly aware of the penalties established by the Criminal Code. But no doubt we shall have a manifesto from Ramsay MacDonald on this too, and Heaven's protection will be invoked for the men who, only a little while ago, were calling it to guard—Ramsay MacDonald's new found friends, the Socialist-Revolutionary allies of General Denikin and the Grand Duke Nicholas.

The sooner the British working-class realises how it has been tricked on this matter by the I.L.P. and Fabian politicians who lead the other members of the Labour Party Executive by the nose, the sooner will come the moment when it determines to safeguard its international ties of friendship by eliminating from power the elements who are leading it into the paths of alliance with capitalism and reaction the world over. The Communist Party will do its utmost to hasten that day, not in order to wreck the Labour Party, but, on the contrary, to make it clearly and unambiguously a fighting party of the working-class.

# THE REASON WHY:—The Comm

## *Why has the Communist Party sought affiliation to the Labour Party?*

THE Communist Party is a working-class party. It exists because the working-class exists faced with the necessity to battle for its very existence against the crushing burdens imposed by the capitalist system of exploitation.

This system has now reached a crisis in its development. Its inner contradictions—always existent—have under the stimulus of war developed into patent antagonisms which threaten the total destruction of human society.

Capitalist finance is in a state of chaos: production under the control of the financier and for his advantage is brought to a standstill until the chaos can be resolved. Everywhere by unemployment, wage-cuts, lengthening of the working day and other devices for increasing exploitation, the working masses are reduced to a condition of misery without example.

The rule of the capitalist class leaves no room for life for the workers. The workers must, therefore, to gain life, put an end to the rule of the capitalist class. Only when the powers of Government and the machinery of social control have passed into the hands of the workers will it be possible to look forward to a better and brighter state of things.

To reach this state of working-class rule, direction and control is the aim of the Communist Party, and it seeks and sought affiliation to the Labour Party in the belief that thereby it could better attain to that end.

\* \* \*

It held this view for pressing and immediate reasons.

Before the workers can advance they must cease to retreat. Before they can stand to do battle as a class they must cease to think it imperative to take action as sections.

Miners, textile workers, transport workers, metal workers, wood workers—one after the other we have seen them go down into defeat. As sections they fought, as sections they fell, and each successive fall intensified the general feeling of the hopelessness of struggle.

TO END THIS PARALYSIS OF FEAR—THIS DEMORALISATION OF DEFEAT—THE COMMUNIST PARTY SOUGHT AFFILIATION TO THE LABOUR PARTY AS ONE AMONG SEVERAL WAYS OF FORMING A UNITED WORKING-CLASS DEFENSIVE FRONT AGAINST TRIUMPHANT CAPITALIST AGGRESSION.

It thought, and still thinks that this united defensive is an indispensable pre-requisite for any forward movement, industrial or political.

It thought, and still thinks that everybody concerned for the workers must, in face of existing facts, come to exactly the same conclusion. It was therefore, if not confident, at any rate hopeful that the response would be immediate, generous and practical.

Especially did it expect agreement from those who should be concerned (as a "Labour" Party) with securing the political unity of the working-class and its manly resistance to alike the threats and blandishments of the capitalist class agents and agencies.

The Communist Party sought affiliation therefore, because, seeking working-class emancipation, it saw in the Labour Party a potent instrument for effecting that class unity which is indispensable for the workers' class triumph.

## *What benefit has accrued thencefrom to the Labour Movement?*

That the Communist Party failed to secure affiliation with the Labour Party is common knowledge. The manner in which it became common knowledge is enough to show that the Labour Movement and the Communist Party have each gained greatly from the fact that the application was made.

Before the Conference a desperate press campaign, initiated by a section of the Labour Party Executive—a campaign designed to show, in the manner to which the bourgeois press has accustomed us, that Soviet Russia (and therefore the Communist Party) were the enemies of "justice" and "democracy"—showed the concern felt by this section about the result. And the open rejoicing of the bourgeois press at the result gives a true measure of the motives that inspired alike the press campaign and the vote in which it culminated.

FEAR OF THE WORKING-CLASS GROWN DESPERATE IS THE KEY-NOTE OF CAPITALIST POLITICS. FEAR OF THE WORKING-CLASS GROWN SELF-CONFIDENT IS THE KEY-NOTE OF THE POLITICS OF THAT LITTLE

BAND OF PETTY MIDDLE-CLASS THEORETICIANS WHO ARE THE LEADERS OF THE LEADERS OF THE LABOUR PARTY.

They saw a General Election coming.

They saw Lloyd George and Co. preparing to take the field as Crusaders against Bolshevism, Communism and working-class Revolution. They feared for their electoral chances in the face of this campaign; and, hence, at every opportunity, Communism must be repudiated, and the Labour Party differentiated from Soviet Russia and all that it stands for.

The whole Edinburgh Conference was stage-managed with a single concern for the General Election and the need to evade Lloyd George's campaign against things Communistic.

As a political manoeuvre it was well enough in its way. But it was a manoeuvre that pre-supposed that the only thing that mattered was securing a parliamentary majority—quite regardless of the conditions under which it was secured and the degree of unity and class-consciousness involved in its attainment.

The fate of the Communist Party's application for affiliation revealed:—

*First*, that the leaders of the big trade union combinations who appear to be the Labour Party's leaders are themselves the led.

*Second*, that they are led by a group of middle-class theorists, whose ideal is a Bureaucratic State Socialism, in which the workers occupy that subordinate station to which capitalism has consigned them.

*Thirdly*, that these middle-class theoreticians attain their ends by their personal influence with the few trade union leaders.

*Fourthly*, that, despite their professions of "justice" and "democracy", these theoreticians do not scruple to encourage these leaders to set up a dictatorial machine which makes it all but impossible for the rank-and-file mass of the trade unions to influence either the decisions, the policy or the constitution of the Labour Party.

\* \* \*

To put it in a nutshell.

The treatment of the Communist Party by the dominant group in the Labour Party Executive reveals the fact that the Party *under its present leadership* is neither a Party nor of Labour.

It is not a Party—it is a machine dictating to and manipulating great trade union combinations, each of which enters as a separate unit into the total agglomeration which the name "Party" serves to conceal.

It is not of (nor for "Labour") since the pre-occupation of its present leadership is to placate the middle-class, even at the cost of suppressing every genuine working-class tendency and group making for the "self-determination" of "Labour"—i.e., the working-class.

To have revealed this much is a great gain; and this has been done by the Communist Party's application for affiliation.

## *What has been the gain to the Communist Party?*

In the course of this struggle it soon became apparent that the hostility to the Communist Party came, not from the rank-and-file of the unions (however conservative) but from a group of Fabianised doctrinaires bent upon an industrial truce with capital and a political truce with the middle-class.

The struggle was not, is not, and never has been, a fight between the practical instincts of the working mass and certain theories which the Communist Party seek to impose upon them.

THE STRUGGLE HAS BEEN BETWEEN A GROUP OF THEORISTS (WHO HAVE HITHERTO BEEN ABLE TO LEAD THE WORKERS BY THE NOSE) AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY, WHOSE PROGRAMME IS IN EXACT ACCORD WITH THE PRACTICAL INSTINCTS OF THE RANK-AND-FILE MASSES.

The instinct of the masses is to struggle, and to unite. They are kept from both struggle and unity by that habitual self-distrust (bred of and intensified by their boss-class controlled education) which makes them accept and defer to leaders whose programme keeps within the plane of boss-class morality and institutions.

The Communist Party appeals to the mass instincts—begotten in the actual day-to-day struggle.

The Fabian and Right-Wing I.L.P. theoreticians appeal to the prejudices and superstitions which the masses have been saturated in the elementary school, and by the capitalist press.

Every argument urged at Edinburgh against the Communist Party whether by Hodges, Macdonald, Henderson or Thomas,

# Communist Party and the Labour Party

was applauded by the whole capitalist press. Tried by this test the Labour Party ideology and leadership is demonstrated as friendly to the capitalist order of society.

That press which traduced the miners in their desperate struggle during the lock-out; which clamoured for the suppression of the Communist Party because it defended the miners and encouraged them to persevere; that press applauded Frank Hodges' "lawyer-like" assertion that the Communists were "intellectual slaves" to Moscow, and that the "free instincts" of the British worker would not tolerate dictatorship.

Those who had urged on the crushing of the workers, industry by industry, until their condition was misery beyond precedent and slavery without stint—these applauded Mr. Hodges' fine libertarian sentiments as weapons against the Communist Party, whose sole aim is to free the workers from capitalist dictatorship.

This fact alone should suffice to vindicate the Communist Party.

The workers have had years of bitter experience in which to learn that those whom the boss-controlled press praise, deserves little of praise from the workers; that those whom this press traduces are among the best friends the workers can have.

The Communist Party has gained the endorsement of its enemies by the capitalist class press and politicians.

It has gained the open avowal by its most conspicuous opponents that they are as bitterly opposed to unqualified working-class rule as are the capitalist dictators themselves.

It has gained the consciousness of its own strength which came when on the floor of the Edinburgh Conference every adherent of the Webb-Macdonald, Fabian-I.L.P., middle-class ideology, let it be known that in the trade union and in the locality their thorn in the flesh was—the Communist Party.

The Communist Party has gained, too, the knowledge of its weakness. Had it been numerically strong enough, and sufficiently well-organised, the Edinburgh result would have been reversed. Wherever the C.P. was at all strong, the rank-and-file were strong for its affiliation.

The instance of the miners alone will prove this. Of the 900,000 votes which Mr. Frank Hodges cast against affiliation at least one-third, probably one-half, should have been cast the other way. South Wales, and Fife were (we learn) strong for our affiliation. And, unless we are misinformed a majority in Scotland was for affiliation. Large minorities in Yorkshire and in Durham were for affiliation—Yet, with these facts in his possession, Mr. Hodges coolly talks of British "liberty" and Moscow "dictatorship" as he casts the whole vote against the wishes of these large sections of his own rank-and-file.

The Communist Party has gained not only the knowledge that a large increase of membership and a little more intensive organisation will enable it to emerge in triumph.

It has gained from the fact that the very prominence given to their defeat in the capitalist press has extended a knowledge of their existence and their aims to sections of workers whom hitherto they have been unable to reach.

Most of all—the Communist Party has gained from the practical fact that to make their case good against the Communists, the leaders of the Labour Party had to make (or to allow their subordinates to make) a show of prosecuting the working-class struggle, a show of considering the rank-and-file, and a show of approval for the conception of a united working-class front against capitalism.

Because they had thrown out the Communists, the Labour Party had to contemplate themselves becoming the ruling Party in Britain.

This is a clear gain to the Communist Party, in that anything that stirs up the rank-and-file to contemplate and expect class action, prepares the way alike for the struggle and the victory.

And the victory of the working-class is all that the Communist Party cares about.

## Why will the Communist Party continue to press for affiliation, nationally and locally?

The Communist Party will continue its struggle for affiliation not only because the gains from that struggle are as large as they are and as far reaching, but because also the struggle itself is a means of concentrating the attention of the working masses

and particularly the rank-and-file of the trade unions upon the issues at stake.

Every time the question is raised there is raised with it the question of the united working-class front, the question of the direction of the working-class struggle, and the question of the real nature of capitalist "democracy."

The Communist Party cannot be rejected by the Labour Party on any honest grounds. It has definitely and in set terms accepted the Labour Party constitution. It has done more. It has submitted to the indignity of a Questionnaire, which the Labour Party Executive simply *dare not* submit to their constituent bodies, the I.L.P., the Fabians and the S.D.F. It has done everything to demonstrate the sincerity of its desire to serve the working-class in collaboration with the bodies federated into the Labour Party. And its rejection was secured by an arrogant and misleading assertion as to its intentions, which revealed not the faults of the Communist Party but the fears of the middle-class theorists, that, inspired by the presence of the Communists, the rank-and-file might escape from their tutelage.

The Communist Party will persevere in its application for affiliation until these facts are sufficiently brought home to the rank-and-file to make its admission a matter of certainty and right.

## Why will the Communist Party help the Labour Party to gain power?

The Labour Party, on the showing of its leaders at Edinburgh, contemplates seriously becoming after the next election the ruling Party in the State.

We emphasise this in order to emphasise also the continued determination of the Communist Party whether affiliated or not, to assist them to gain that position.

We shall do so for several reasons.

*Firstly*, because, as we have said, to make good their bid for power, the Labour Party must (to some extent) unite the workers in opposition to the capitalist State and rule.

We will help them in order to extend the unity and intensify the opposition.

*Secondly*, because the Labour Party can only gain power by discrediting in the minds of the masses all Bourgeois Parties and politicians. However much the Labour Party may say that it proposes to rule in the interests of *all* classes, and however much it gains middle-class support by reason of that profession, the Labour Party can only secure power by virtue of the united backing of the working mass and this will be given them only so far as they raise the hope that the workers' interests will be considered and their grievances remedied as never before.

*Thirdly*, we shall help them to gain power, confident that when in power they must either make good their professions to the workers—and so dissipate their middle-class support—or fail to do so and, in failing, drive the working mass whose hopes they will have roused only to dash to the ground, over to the Communist Party, whose criticism will have prepared them for the event.

*Fourthly*, we shall help them because, when in power, they will have to handle concrete issues vitally affecting the whole economic and political life of the State. The practical test alone will show whether they will do this in a Bourgeois or in a Proletarian manner. If they handle them in a Proletarian way the Communist Party and the Labour Party will be at one. If in a Bourgeois way they will vindicate the Communist Party's criticism and in their fall clear the way for its triumph in turn.

*Fifthly*, and finally, we shall support them because, while the Labour Party is in opposition to a Bourgeoisie in possession, any hostility to the Labour Party tends to be mistaken for (and in its outcome to be) a practical aid to the Bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party is so genuinely concerned for working-class unity as the pre-requisite for the betterment of the condition of the workers and the prelude to their emancipation, that it is prepared to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to secure this end.

To prove that the Communist Party is sincere and practical in its identification with the day-to-day struggle of the workers for immediate improvements, we will help the Labour Party to victory and do it proudly, confident that in the end the sacrifice of personal convenience involved will be trifling compared with the gain to the Communist Party and the working-class.

(Continued on page 9)



# Some Lessons from Edinburgh

THE Edinburgh Conference of the Labour Party marks the culmination of the first period in the application of the Communist Party affiliation. For the second time the Executive of the Labour Party succeeded in getting a majority against us. The discussion was marked by more bitter and malicious opposition from the theoretical and spiritual leaders of the Labour Party than was the case last year. To this we need only retort: "Jupiter, thou art angry: it means thou art wrong."

\* \* \*

In the present alignment of forces within the Labour Party an averse decision was, of course, to be expected. It brought, therefore, neither surprise nor dismay. On the contrary, we have every reason to rejoice at the sum total of the results of the first period of our efforts to secure affiliation with the Labour Party. We have every reason to expect, from a pursuance of the same policy, still greater results at the end of the second period.

The Edinburgh Conference has furnished a very eloquent illustration of the inestimable value which has accrued from our affiliation policy both to the Labour Movement as a whole and to our Party.

To the Labour movement the value lies in that the principles of the Communist Party will be introduced for discussion in every trade union, every Labour Council or local Labour Party. Wherever there is a gathering of workers, the subject of what our Party stands for will come under discussion.

Hundreds of newspapers and magazines, both capitalist and socialist, have carried to the widest and most backward masses vile criticism of the Communist Party.

Even thus have they done us a tremendous service, for the workers are intelligent enough to understand that a Party, against which so many poisoned shafts and arrows have been hurled with such malice and slander by the plutocratic press, and against which the opposition of a handful of middle-class theoreticians is so bitter and so malicious, is worthy of attention, is worthy of being given a hearing.

With the working-class interested in the programme and tactics of the Communist Party, half the work of bringing them to our view-point is done. This alone brings them many steps nearer their emancipation.

In this great task our enemies have helped us handsomely. We can only extend to them our thanks. Some day the working-class of Great Britain will reward them according to their deserts.

\* \* \*

It is natural that a feeling of injured pride should be entertained by some of our members. This purely subjective feeling must be sacrificed for the objective requirements of the revolutionary movement. To lose sight of the larger objects and to be carried away by personal feelings of disgust is to play into the hands of those who wish to keep us out of contact with the masses and their class organisations.

Let the middle-class Socialists indulge in petty quarrels with us. We shall pay no attention to that. We shall keep our eyes fixed upon larger objects.

The Party is pretty unanimous in its stand on the affiliation policy itself and on the question of supporting the L.P. to power. Hardly anyone who had doubts as to the advisability of seeking affiliation will now, after the Edinburgh Conference, hesitate to admit that the policy has been fully justified and that there is no ground for its revision.

Those who opposed it on "principle" (in reality because they just cannot stand the Hendersons and the Macdonalds—who find these opportunist gentlemen offensive to their sensitive and delicate natures—who prefer to carry on their "revolutionary activities" far from the madding crowd, so as not to soil the purity of their maiden principles by contact with those ruffians) are, happily, not in our ranks. They are out elsewhere in quest of "pure" parties, "pure" unions and "pure" revolutions. On their banners the word "purity" is writ in large letters and over it a dainty broom as a warning. Alas, they have failed to understand that only the newly-born are pure; that in order to become pure again we must go through purgatory. The direct route is only open to the babes. If the present trade unions are hells we have simply got to go through it—not save our souls by running away to start unions of our own. If the local Labour Party is a hell, we have got to go through it and so with the National Labour Party. If there is any travelling to paradise to be undertaken we have all got to do it together, trade union and all, however impure they may be when we start, and let those who are best fit lead the way.

\* \* \*

If the Affiliation Policy has already brought significant results both to the Labour Movement and the Party, if our endeavours to carry it out have already been richly rewarded, we must not fail to recognise the fact that there have been revealed to us great defects and weaknesses in our own Party. On methods, the degree of team work and organisation to be employed in carrying out this (or any other) policy there will hardly be unanimity in our ranks. It is therefore of vital importance, not only for every member of the Party to understand clearly what have been the gains from our policy of affiliation, but also to help ascertain what were the causes which hindered us from making the policy a greater success; and this in order that the opportunities which present themselves to us in consequence of the Edinburgh decision may be utilised to greater advantage than heretofore.

Given a good cause, we are told, it matters little who upholds it or how. A good cause, a good policy, speaks eloquently for itself. A bad cause requires the political subtlety of a Macdonald, the ministerial cajolery of a Henderson, the empty bombast of a college debater like Frank Hodges, the buffoonery of a Jack Jones or the crocodile tears of a Bevin.

\* \* \*

It is poor consolation to say that our cause is good enough to succeed and that history is with us, when we neglect the work to make it a success. There is in this what may be termed a Communist fatalism, which if allowed to permeate our Party will work disaster.

Those of us who had the good fortune of sitting the front of the machine by which the middle-class I.L.P.ers and the Fabians manipulated the Labour Party Conference (and they did it with ability—always on the look-out for any opening to discredit the Communists before the rank-and-file) could not help but feel that our cause must indeed be good to succeed. For as to methods of combating our antagonists, as to organisation and team work, there was very little. There were Communist delegates who tried their level best to uphold the cause of their Party. In most cases they could get the floor when they wanted it, and on many occasions more than once; but there was no plan of action adopted beforehand, no meetings of Communist delegates to prepare resolutions, or the support or defeat of resolutions, no arguments prepared to present our views on every point in the agenda. All depended on the personal ability of every delegate and the amount of interest he had in the question.

This is no doubt due to the fact that while the Party at its Conference adopted the affiliation policy it has not done sufficient to get it properly discussed by the membership, or to so impress them with the importance of consistently driving towards the goal, that whoever should be delegated to the Conference would know exactly what he was to do and how it was to be done.

This, in addition to meetings of the delegates in Edinburgh on every question, would have led to that team-work and organised effort, without which there is nothing left to rely upon but fate.

\* \* \*

The state of affairs in our Party in so far as methods of carrying out policy is concerned has been revealed through the Edinburgh Conference. It will prove of great value to us. To realise our defects is the first step towards doing away with them. We must discuss these defects in every branch, in every divisional Committee, in the Executive, in the sub-Executive and at the Party Conference. Everywhere should be discussed ways and means of how most effectively to work and carry out the affiliation policy now that we are entering upon the second period of its application.

Let resolutions and suggestions be worked out at these meetings and sent for Party publicity in order that when a policy on how to carry on affiliation work and the work of supporting the L.P. to power has been adopted, our Party will be clear about it. But until such time, there is immediate work to be done.

The opportunities which present themselves in consequence of the Edinburgh decision and the tremendous publicity given to it are immense. There is plenty of work for everybody. Propagandists, agitators, writers and organisers, every member of the branch must take part in the work in connection with the unusual interest aroused in the masses by the Edinburgh decision.

To deal effectively with the misinterpretations and distortions of our principles by our enemies, to explain and emphasise the important points in our programme and tactics, to expose the true nature of those forces which at present inspire the Labour Movement, namely the middle-class ideology issuing from the right wing I.L.P., the intellectuals, the Fabians and the Guild Socialists; to make it clear to the workers that it is these middle-class forces in the Labour Party which stand in the way of unity of the working-class nationally and internationally; to carry on a systematic and energetic campaign for a united front of the Labour Movement and its great Labour bodies, the federations and unions, in spite of that middle-class ideology—such is the task to which all hands must be put, all our energy diverted.

Save the Labour Movement from Webbism, Macdonaldism and Hendersonism, such should be our slogan.

\* \* \*

But we must take great care that in spilling the water out of the tub we do not spill the baby along with it.

Keep the movement intact, work for greater amalgamation and unity, out-fight the middle-class influences in it.

It is not enough to sow the seeds of our cause, weed out the bad influences from the soil and constantly irrigate it. We must prepare to reap the harvest and store it in our Party for the benefit of the working-class and its revolutionary movement.

The Communist Party differs from the old socialist parties in that it is not content with merely throwing the seeds of socialism into the masses to take root as best they may, just for the educational value of it. It seeks to become a Party of the working-class. For this it must attain a certain degree of organised influence in the masses and their class organisations. Our Party activities must bend towards this end. A campaign that does not result in the increase of the strength of our Party and its influence in the masses is effort and energy wasted. Not to use this added strength for the constructive purpose of the Labour Movement and against the destructive forces in it is to remain an educational society and not a party of the proletariat.



# THE LABOUR PARTY AND IMPERIALISM

**N**OWHERE does the present Labour Party leadership show such an intellectual slavery to middle-class views as in international affairs. It is difficult to find an instance where its attitude has differed from prevailing Liberal opinions. When the Liberal Party glorifies the War, so does the Labour Party; when the Liberal Party supports Mr. Wilson, the Labour Party follows suit; when the Liberal Party hails the League of Nations or the Washington Conference as the hope of the world, the Labour Party rivals their enthusiasm; and when the Liberal Party turns and condemns the Peace Treaty, the Labour Party plucks up courage to do so also.

Why is it the Labour Party has no policy of its own in international affairs? In home politics it is claimed that there is an unbridgeable chasm between the Liberal and Labour policies—for or against private profit; for or against economic exploitation. Why does this not apply internationally?

Who determines the policy of the Labour Party? Clearly not the rank-and-file. It is hard enough for them to insist that some sort of a stand must be made against economic exploitation at home. International policy is almost entirely left in the hands of a group of Liberal-minded intellectuals. They vary from staunch imperialists like Sidney Webb to Liberal idealists like Wedgewood and Macdonald, who think in phrases of "national freedom," and "home rule" and "self-government within the Empire," phrases which conceal the support of capitalist rule. A policy drawn up by Liberals and based on Liberal-Capitalist ideas, naturally reflects the changes of capitalist policy. But, whatever the variations, it remains a middle-class Liberal and not a working-class Socialist policy.

Its Liberal policy makes it stand for exploitation. Hence the silence on South Africa. Smuts, the close friend of the Labour Party Liberals, must not be criticised. In India the overwhelming mass of the nationalist movement has rejected and boycotted the Government of India Act. The Indian Trade Union Congress has scorned it. But it has been welcomed by a handful of Indian capitalists, landlords and their hangers-on. Therefore a resolution supporting it is foisted on the Labour Party as if in mockery of the 25,000 Indians now in prison at the hands of the British Government, and the exploited masses of workers and peasants, slaving for British and Indian capitalism. Tom Shaw, in Frankfurt declaims against imperialism and militarism: "We in England will speak against it, write against it, and, if necessary, fight against it." Has he been told of the existence of the British Empire?

The Liberal influence comes out clearly in the resolutions on

the condition of Europe. The League of Nations, Revision of the Peace Treaty, fixed reparations—all the typical list of capitalist remedies for a capitalist chaos. And how could it be otherwise? Is there really such a great difference between Liberals like Commander Kenworthy and Labour men like Colonel Wedgewood? If they were put to drafting resolutions on foreign policy would the results be so different? Tom Shaw, in moving the resolution, said it "demanded what he believed the last Conference of bankers would have recommended." At least he has good, up-to-date capitalist backing. But Ramsay Macdonald could hardly hope to convince the international financiers with his statement that "It was an inference of history that the League of Nations was the only idea that could save Europe from future wars." Apparently even the Second International must take a back seat. Is it because it does not represent the "whole community"?

It is not because the capitalists have already scrapped the League of Nations that we deride the Labour Party for its pathetic support of it. It is because the very idea of lumping capitalists and workers together as a "nation" is part of the working of capitalist mentality and betrays the workers into supporting capitalist interests.

The Conference unanimously passed a resolution "to oppose any war entered into by a Government whatever the ostensible object of the war." The "inference from history," whether the collapse of the Second International, or the volte face of the Liberal Party in August, 1914, does not allow of much value being attached to this, as long as the Labour Party allows its policy to be moulded for it on capitalist lines. As long as it allows itself to be bamboozled by the Liberal politicians in the Labour Party into talking of nations as if they were units, and into ignoring the distinction between exploiters and exploited, it cannot avoid being drawn into the maelstrom of capitalist squabbles, and, in the issue, into following capitalism into war.

In contrast to this the Communist policy is clear. It is firstly to cease talking of the militarism of France, or the militarism of Germany, words which have no meaning whatever, and only lead to the workers being used as the tools of capitalist policy. It is secondly to recognise the unity of working-class interests in this country with the interests of the workers in other countries, whether part of the Empire or not, and to support them in opposition to the capitalist interests. And thirdly, this recognition must be realised in practise by the active contact, help, and united action of the exploited workers the world over. It is a simple and even a familiar policy, but it cannot be carried out by Liberals, however well-meaning.

## THE REASON WHY—The Communist Party and the Labour Party

(Continued from Page 7)

### *Why is the Communist Party content to wait?*

It may be said—Ramsay Macdonald will be the first to say—that there is something dishonest, something unprincipled in this Party self-sacrifice.

There is no dishonesty and no deception. We take our stand upon our bed-rock principle, that of the workers' class struggle. Whatever in our conceptions of the State, of the struggle itself, or of the programme upon which the workers should proceed, may divide us from the theoreticians who lead the leaders of the Labour Party, nothing of principle and still less of practice divides, should divide, or shall divide the Communist Party from the workers, rightly struggling to be free from capitalist domination and exploitation.

The issues between us and the theoreticians can wait until time and events have raised them as issues for immediate solution.

That there are such differences we not only do not deny—we affirm. That the day will come when they will be raised and in a fashion that will brook no delay we affirm likewise.

But we affirm equally that the day is not yet.

Whether the workers are to rule through a Soviet Dictatorship or through a Parliamentary Democracy is a very important question. But, so long as the workers, instead of being in a position to rule are content to submit and serve, its discussion (to the exclusion of action) may leave us paralysed and inept.

When the Labour Party is in power the question can be raised as a vital and immediate issue. It can be discussed in the light of accomplished facts and in relation to ascertained and urgent needs.

Till then it is the duty of the Communist Party (as it would be of any party professing to seek working-class emancipation) to put its convenience on one side and work for the one thing needful—the reconstitution of the working-class front, and the

dissipation of the despair which is making the working mass powerless before the onrush of their oppressors.

Above all mere personal feelings we put the needs of the working class and the objective requirements of the working-class revolutionary struggle, national and international.

Taking these into account we discard pride and prejudices and with a single eye to the interests of the workers, proclaim our demand for working-class solidarity.

We will urge and we shall get a United Working-Class Defensive Front as the only possible check to the Capitalist offensive.

We will urge and we shall secure affiliation to the Labour Party as an important contribution towards that unity.

We shall work for and we shall secure the electoral triumph of the British Labour Party as a means of enabling the British workers to pass from the defensive to the offensive and so give an impetus to the workers' struggle in the whole of Western Europe.

And we shall do all this confident that thereupon will ensue a situation from which the British workers, with the Communist Party at their head, will emerge the triumphant upholders of the British Soviet Republic.

## *The Communist*

*A Weekly Organ of the Third (Communist) International*  
*Official Organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain*

16 King Street, Covent Garden  
London, W.C.2

Telephone Gerrard 877

"The Communist" can be sent to any reader direct from this office at the prepaid, post-paid rate of 3/3 per quarter, or pro rata.

Terms for quantities: 1/4 for 13, post paid, sale or return; monthly account. All communications to:—Circulation Manager, "The Communist," 16, King Street, W.C. 2.

# The Pact of Peace

## Labour Party Leaders ask Workers to Surrender

THE henchmen of capitalism in the ranks of Labour have again spoken. Listen—!

"Let there be a ten years' truce, a pact of peace, between Capital and Labour." Thus Mr. F. Hodges in *Manchester Despatch*; thus Mr. Henderson in the *Times* and the *Labour Magazine*; thus Mr. Appleton and Mr. Pugh; and thus Sir William Noble in the *Daily Herald*:—"The spirit that is shown by Mr. Hodges is all that could be desired. . . . The workers must, in my judgment, be taught to realise that in the 'fat years' they must make provision for the 'lean years'."

The combination is interesting. The employer in the columns of the *Labour Daily Herald*; the Labour Party Leader in the columns of the capitalist *Times*.

Of all the superficial proposals to put before the working masses none could be more treacherous. Of all the "constructive" proposals to put before the Labour Movement, none could be more absurd.

To ask the robber and the robbed to be good friends while the robber continues to bleed and starve the robbed is ridiculous enough. But to ask victims to go further and quietly to transform their weapons of defence into debating clubs, is more than ridiculous; it is simply criminal. Nevertheless this is the meaning of the proposed "Industrial Truce—the Pact of Peace."

It is not a new proposal by any means. Nor is it the first time Mr. Henderson and his middle-class advisers have been associated with this kind of proposal.

### Peace—and Death!

From August, 1914, to September, 1917, they were able to harness the unions of this country to the imperialist policy of the capitalist class. They clinched their arrangements with the Whitley Councils—obviously designed to destroy the rising protests from the workshops of Britain.

They, more than anyone else, led the working-class on to the fields of slaughter at the bidding of their imperialist overlords. They stifled every attempt to assert the independence of the Labour movement.

The price the world has had to pay is greater than can be imagined. 10,000,000 of the world's manhood have been killed. Millions upon millions have become physical wrecks. The industry of Europe has been brought to ruins. Unemployment, hunger, misery, suffering have followed in their trail. And all this because an industrial truce—a pact of class peace—was made by these same Leaders at the very moment when they ought to have fulfilled their pledges to the International in 1912. They should have called to the working masses of the world and rallied them against the oncoming slaughter which they knew was for imperialist ends. Instead they deserted to the capitalist enemy and rallied the workers for slaughter.

The circumstances have changed. The slaughter by shot and shell, by bomb and bayonet has given place to the slower but even more efficacious process of mass starvation. Mr. Hodges has stated that even the British famine has begun. Mr. Henderson says that "considerably more than half the total war wage advances have been deducted from the workers' wages, and that despite the fact that the cost of living is still 80 per cent. above the pre-war level." Within eighteen months the wages of the workers of Britain alone have gone down £10,000,000 per week and Mr. Henderson again states that "the Trade Unions have paid out in the same period some £10,000,000 in unemployment benefit."

Miners, who are working, are so poor that their children beg for bread.

Throughout the length and breadth of the country in every town and village misery and wretchedness stare out of the eyes of the masses.

No one is certain of to-morrow except the poor—certain of their misery.

Those markets which are not shattered are shaky. The exchanges violently fluctuate from day to day—indicating the fevered wretchedness of the countries beyond Britain's frontier.

The employers everywhere conduct a remorseless offensive against the divided labour forces and drive relentless bargains.

Into this arena enters Mr. Henderson with that unctuous air which only a Henderson can assume and holds aloft the new "Pact of Peace." Well might Mr. Smillie call it "the peace of death."

The pact of 1914 culminating the Whitley Councils made possible the violent slaughter of the world's young manhood. The pact of 1922 would seal the fate of civilisation.

### A Surrender to Slavery

For upon what basis could the employers agree except upon that of the continued degradation and subjection of the working masses of the world?

Nothing could be more short-sighted than the case presented by Mr. Henderson and his colleagues.

"The world needs peace," they say. True, too true! It needs peace as never before.

But can the world have peace by the perpetuation of the conditions which make for war?

It cannot, though it be satiated with war to the point of despair. Mr. Henderson knows that; Mr. Hodges knows that. Yet they appeal to the ideal of peace in the name of the practical. They play upon the desire for peace when they know that its previous application was the greatest swindle upon the working masses that history has ever known.

"In a period of world distress, such as we are now living through," says Mr. Henderson, "our primary concern ought to be the immediate welfare of the people. Enthusiasm for ideals is not fed by starvation. On the whole, the workers have displayed singular patience and moderation in very trying circumstances."

So indeed they have. They have practised the peace philosophy even to the point of winning the admiration of Mr. Henderson.

The results glare at us with eyes of misery.

Have the employers been merciful? Will they be merciful in response to Messrs. Henderson's and Hodges' idealistic peace appeal?

Will the lion when hungry play with the lamb?

Will it allow the gentle one to say "grow old whilst we talk and I can grow strong enough to defend myself against you."?

Nothing could be more absurd. Yet thus Mr. Henderson:—"An industrial truce does not mean that Labour will engage itself to remain subordinate to capital, and that we shall not continue to progress to the point at which capital will become subordinate to Labour. The conflict of ideas will go on."

Think of it! Let Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Brownlie approach Sir Allan Smith with the proposals—"Please don't alter existing conditions by a lock-out and we promise faithfully not to seek to alter them by striking against you. Withdraw your demand for 16s. 6d. per week reduction and let us stabilise the existing rates of wages as basic, etc. Let us agree that workshop conditions shall be changed only by mutual consent."

Can we not hear Sir Allan's mocking retort: "come down to earth if you please and talk business."

Sir Allan and Mr. Henderson were both parties to the Whitley Councils. But, do you think that will alter his reply?

### Stabilising Famine

The proposals are neither good business nor common sense. But again listen to Mr. Henderson: "While the cost of living is still 80 per cent. above the 1914 level, the present wages of the miners only show an increase varying between 20 to 50 per cent. above the 1914 wages." Then as a condition of truce he declares: "Existing rates of wages to be stabilised as basic with the present level of cost of living registered as 'normal.'"

Stabilise the "British Famine," Mr. Hodges, in the interests of world peace and the gradual growth into being of a new social order. Take your answer from the chairman of your own Labour Party:—

"The old order in industry and commerce can only be re-established if the workers will consent to lower their standard of living to leave a sufficient balance to pay the colossal sums of interest due on war debt, on watered capital, on fabricated bankers' credits and inflated rents. It is no use expecting to remove this massed collection of evil impositions by gradual ameliorative reform. That way we can make little impression on it in the lifetime of a generation. Besides, it is like mowing ripe thistles. As you cut down this year's crop you scatter the seed for the next."

Your steady growth is thus the growth of death, the choking of civilisation with the outworn demands of an age that is dead.

The past demanded profits for the few: To-day declares that the profit-making system is a stumbling block to human advancement.

The Past provided scope and facilities for private enterprise: To-day, private enterprise fetters the production and distribution of the means of life.

To thus fetter the masses with another pact of industrial peace adds to the infamy of the war period an agreement to submerge the masses in its ruins.

Away with it. There is no way to a real peace other than by the workers' victory over capitalism.

### Russian Famine Fund SPECIAL EFFORT MILLION PENNY WEEK JULY 23rd to JULY 30th

If every organised worker in Great Britain gives ONE PENNY during this week, the result will be £33,000.

Take a collection in your Trade Union Branch, Workshop, Co-operative Guild, Sunday School—in fact anywhere and everywhere.

Will you give your penny?

Russian Famine Fund, 35, Gray's Inn Road, W.C. 1.

# OURSELVES: and the Enemy

**Our Labour Party Number** This number is probably the most important one we have yet issued. The official organ of the Communist Party gives an official reply to the long-continued and cunningly executed campaign of the Webbs, Macdonalds and Hendersons, to separate the Communist Party from the rest of the working-class movement.

This number forms, therefore, not only the Communist Party's reply to their assertions and insinuations, but also our appeal to the working mass to judge between us.

Special stress is laid upon the leading article on pages 6, 7, and 9 of this issue. Communists should strain every nerve to get the points therein brought to the notice of (and forced under discussion in) every trade-union branch, workshop committee, trades council, local Labour Party and workers' study group.

**Its Authors** The articles which appear in this issue unsigned are the work of the comrades named in the last issue (with the exception of J. S. Clarke, the distinguished editor of the *Worker*, who, being on a holiday, could not be communicated with in time).

Discussion of the points raised in these articles is invited from members and non-members of the Communist Party alike.

**Honours for Sale** "East-end Coster Fined for Selling O.B.E.'s in the Street." That was a mock headline produced by George Morrow during the war. The Labour Party, a little late in the day, has discovered that it was not so much a joke after all, and we are having a great to-do about "the sale of honours."

In exposing this particular scandal the Labour Party is following a correct instinct. Anything that shows up the corruption of the present governing machine is good. But we are not prepared to go further and support the demand for the cessation of this sale and the awarding of honours by "merit." Mr. Lawson, Labour M.P., and the Duke of Northumberland appear defending this cause on the same page of the *Daily Herald*, and we suspect such bed-fellows. In demanding the cessation of the sale of honours, the Duke of Northumberland is attempting to revive "respect for the aristocracy" and the sort of servility which is being badly damaged by the appearance of known scallywags in the honours lists. That is an object with which we have no sympathy, but of course, the Labour Party has walked right into the trap.

Let the sale of honours continue. Go on, Lloyd George! Bestow knighthoods, marquises, dukedoms and O.B.E.'s on all Bottomlies and Northcliffes, on all war-profiteers, sneak-thieves and shipowners, all coal, iron, oil, and steel masters, on all pimps and prostitutes. Anything that shows up the whole business is good for us. Carry on.

**The Hague** The negotiations at the Hague have broken down owing to the firm determination of capitalist nations not to trade with people who have no respect for property. The question is closed, and will not be re-opened. Most certainly not. You say you've heard that before? But surely you will not doubt this message:—  
PARIS, Sunday.—The special correspondent of the *Petit Parisien* at the Hague, says that the Allied experts, have agreed, in the names of their Governments, that the latter will not recognise, in any circumstances or under any form whatsoever, the transfer of property in Russia to the benefit of new owners and to the neglect of the rights of former owners.

This settles the rumours which have been current for a long time regarding direct negotiations between the Soviet Government and business men.—Exchange.

And then the band played.  
It is, of course, only a question of time before the whole mob of them are back again after the concessions. It will take a little waiting, of course, but in the end they will decide to take their medicine.

**The Famine** This is the more certain because, relatively, the Soviet is now in a somewhat better position regarding the famine. We must not exaggerate this. Farbman in the *Observer* last week, had an article speaking in extravagant terms of the Russian harvest, but admitted that the Commissariat of Agriculture disagreed with him. Anything may happen between the end of June, when he wrote, and the gathering of the harvest. But we are glad to say that *as far as can be seen now*, things will be much better this autumn. There is light coming through the trees. That of course, does not mean that we are home. The effort must be kept up until the harvest is gathered and we know for sure. It would be the last tragedy of all if so near the end aid should cease. It is for that reason we again press on our readers the need of sending anything they can spare to the Workers' Famine Relief, 35, Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C. 1.

**Golden Threads** One touch of nature makes the whole world kin. The greatest touch of all, it seems, has descended upon Sir Thomas Glen-Coats—chairman of the historic firm of J. and P. Coats—just as sooner or later (most probably sooner) it will descend upon

business because their premises are choked with articles and nothing is being redeemed."

Is this one of the industrial conditions our truce-mongers propose to stabilise for ten years?

**Circuses** By way of consolation for without Bread lack of work—and maintenance—the tin miners of a Cornish town recently received a visit from no less a person than the wife of the Prime Minister. According to the Press reports they signified their appreciation in the usual way with cheers and ribbons, for which they were rewarded with a message that should certainly be preserved in the municipal archives for a wiser generation to wonder at.

Having reminded her audience that on the occasion of a strike in Wales the men got nothing, the good lady proceeded thus: "You are better off than that and have a little to keep you from starvation. Still I know that an independent people do not like doles. They prefer work. I can assure you that when I go back to London I will put your case before the Government." (italics ours.)

Some assurance, what!

**Plebs** The new Plebs—for this month starts a new series of 48 pages at the old price of sixpence—deserves a good welcome. Left wing publications are not in so good a condition that we can pass by a big advance by one without comment. Among the good stuff in the enlarged magazine is a continuation of Fred Shaw's extracts from a minute book of the "Old Mechanics" in 1853 in Huddersfield (this body is now one of the constituent parts of the A.E.U.) How easy things were in those days, both in spelling and in keeping accounts. Here is one entry:—

The 20 10 9 down from the Bank should not have been put in this book Therefore I will deduct it of or add it to which you have a mind to call it.

In those days, moreover, the membership had a proper care for the needs of their officials. This the only entry under March 15, 1853:—

Officers' Beer, ..... 1s. 8d.  
Committy, do, ..... 3s. 3d.

Beer would probably be 2d. a pint then. A pleasant night! A custom of great virtue! Ah happy days! for it was so, one hundred beery years ago!

## MEETINGS

### Communist Party Branches

CROYDON. Saturday, Woodside, 8 p.m. Sunday, Katherine Street (outside Town Hall), 8 p.m. Good speakers.

DUNDEE. Every Sunday, 2.30 p.m. and 6.30 p.m., Albert Square. Prominent speakers.

HUDDERSFIELD. Sunday, July 23rd, 11 a.m., Market Place; 6.30 p.m., St. George's Square. G. H. Shillitoe (Castleford).

KENNINGTON. Meetings every Sunday evening outside Kennington Theatre, Kennington Park, 8 p.m. July 23rd. Dave Kendall.

SOUTHEND. Meetings every Sunday, Marine Parade, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.

SURREY HOLIDAY CAMP, Newdigate, Surrey. Beautiful scenery; good food; 35s. week, 5s. 6d. day. Full August 5th to 18th.

FREEMASONRY is a curse to Humanity from the Christ Ethic. Speaker: Rodway, 149, Merton Road, Wimbledon.

## LITERATURE FOR THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

L. COTTON,

54, ROSEBERRY AVENUE, LONDON, E.C. 1.  
(Late of 28, East Road, London, N. 1).

BOW C.P. Garden Party, 6, Wellington Road, Bow, Saturday, July 22nd, 3.30 p.m.

## CANCELLED

Await further announcement

## CIRCULATION REPORTS BOOK PRIZE OFFER

We have had a fair response from literature secretaries to our appeal on July 8th, asking for circulation reports, but many have not yet responded. We previously stated that reports must reach us not later than the 20th inst., but as we desire to give every secretary an opportunity of competing, we are now extending the time limit to the 25th.

Remember, we offer a bound volume of the A.B.C. of Communism for the best report. This should be not more than 300 words in length, and should be a short, concise account of local efforts to push the sale of the paper.

### CIRCULATION MANAGER

on the meanest of his factory slaves. Lest any anxiety be felt concerning his dependants it is satisfactory to note that the fortune of the Thread King—as the deceased was affectionately known to his intimates—is estimated to run easily into seven figures. Moreover, five other members of the same family have joined the great majority during the past ten years, their combined leaveings amounting to well over £8,000,000.

**Thread-Bare** The same cannot be said of a woman of the working-class, who died in South Wales about the same time as Sir Thomas, her case, by a curious coincidence being reported on the same page of the same paper. This woman was the mother of 13 children and died in giving birth to the last of them. According to the minister who officiated at the burial there were only three rooms in the house and children had to take their meals from the table on which the coffin lay.

**Pawn-Graphic** Meanwhile, the millions of workless slowly starve. So desperate indeed has their plight become, that even Mr. Clynes finds need to intrude a note of healthy realism into the make-believe atmosphere of the House of Commons: "They have no resources," he said in the course of the recent debate on the "gap." "The pawnshops are full. Some pawnbrokers have told me they will be compelled to go out of

[Owing to the civil war followed by the Free State Censorship our comrades of the Communist Party of Ireland have been unable to produce their official organ, "The Workers' Republic" for two weeks. Pending the completion of arrangements for the reissue of their organ we have placed this page at their disposal]

## *The Workers' Republic*

(Official Organ of the Communist  
Party of Ireland)

Editorial Office: 22, St. Patrick's Road, Dublin

### *Statement by the Editorial Committee*

**T**HE National Executive Committee of the Irish Communist Party and the Editorial Committee of *The Workers' Republic* regret that the official organ of the Irish Section of the Third International was unable to appear the last two weeks.

The fight against the Imperialist Free State Government has temporarily obliged us to concentrate on other aspects of this struggle.

Despite the suppression of the "newly acquired liberties" (*moryah*!) of the Irish People by the Free

State, the young Communist Party of Ireland, aided by our comrades of the British Party, will still hold aloft the banner of Communism in Ireland by continuing to publish henceforth that fearless champion of the Irish workers—*The Workers' Republic*.

The manifesto of the Communist International given below was published in our issue of July the First, and is here reproduced in order to attract even wider support than before for our journal in the coming critical times.

**Look out for next issue of *The Workers' Republic*!!**

R. CONNOLLY

J. J. O'LEARY

G. McLAY

*Editorial Committee, "Workers' Republic"*

# The Executive Committee of the Communist International TO THE WORKERS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

**T**HE Irish proletariat is again being faced with a fateful decision. After prolonged peace negotiations English Imperialism is again preparing to coerce the Irish people by force of arms.

After all the efforts of the English bourgeoisie to maintain its domination by force of arms had been frustrated by the heroic self-sacrificing defence of the Irish people, it was obliged to come to an understanding with the Irish bourgeoisie. For the semblance of an independent Irish Free State the representatives of the Irish capitalists, Collins, Griffith and Co., sacrificed the fruits of the long and successful struggle, and received in return, as a Judas reward, the right to exploit the Irish workers together with the English bourgeoisie.

The party of the small peasants and of those workers who are not as yet class-conscious, represented by De Valera, saw through this game. However, the election compromise which this party has arrived at with the Irish exploiters shows their lack of determination to fight against the latter. The working elements of this party, and above all the Irish Republican Army, which consists mostly of proletarian elements, are justified in being indignant at this pact, and in seeing in it the beginnings of a future betrayal.

The Irish Labour Party is fully aware that every attempt at emancipation on the part of the Irish workers will be hopeless until the party will direct its struggle against the twofold oppression of the English imperialists and the Irish capitalists. **NEVERTHELESS, THE IRISH LABOUR PARTY IS MUCH TOO OPPORTUNIST TO CONTINUE THE REVOLUTIONARY TRADITIONS OF CONNOLLY OR JIM LARKIN.** In all questions concerning real independence, and the Irish Republican Army, **THE IRISH LABOUR PARTY DOES NOT GO BEYOND FINE PHRASES.** Instead of demanding complete independence, it clings to an ultra-constitutionalism, just like its twin-sister, the British Labour Party. Instead of supporting the Republican Army under arms, it advocated an army "under the control of the people." Confusion and indecision exists in its own ranks, and prevents it from being the leader of the Irish Proletariat.

**IT IS ONLY THE YOUNG COMMUNIST PARTY OF IRELAND WHICH HAS THE COURAGE AND THE DETERMINATION TO POINT TO THE RIGHT PATH, AND TO SAY:**

**"IT IS ONLY AFTER THE YOKE OF THE ENGLISH IMPERIALISTS HAS BEEN SHAKEN OFF THAT THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE IRISH EXPLOITERS WILL HAVE ANY CHANCE OF SUCCESS! IT IS ONLY AFTER THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REAL INDEPENDENCE THAT THE CLASS STRUGGLE WILL BE ABLE TO DEVELOP UNTRAMMELED BY ANY NATIONALIST QUESTION."**

The attitude of the proletarian majority of the Irish Republican Army is a proof that the Irish Communist Party, notwithstanding its short existence, is on the right path and represents the will of the Irish working class. The clearer and the more determined it pursues this path, the sooner will the English and Irish capitalists understand that the large majority of the Irish people, the workers, are not inclined to have filched from them the fruits of a long and self-sacrificing struggle for the semblance of the independence which is being offered to them.

The English capitalist class is fully aware of this, and at a moment when it sees that the Irish workers refuse to be swindled on this question, but demand from England a real free state, it will again land its troops in Ireland. It is ready to renew the war rather than grant an independence which would interfere with its plans of exploitation.

**Workers of Great Britain! Your duty now consists in frustrating this predatory campaign of your bourgeoisie! Do not allow the Irish people to be subjugated once more by English capitalists!**

**Workers and Peasants of Ireland! You must be fearless and determined in your struggle for the liberation of Ireland, and thus continue your fight for your own emancipation. But you must bear in mind that liberation from the yoke of the English oppressors is only a prelude to the great final struggle for the abolition of the reign of your own exploiters. In this struggle the Irish Communist Party and the Communist International will assist you with counsel and action.**

**Long live the Irish people freed from national oppression!**

**Long live the Irish proletariat!**

**Long live the solidarity of the English and Irish exploited workers!**

**The Executive Committee of the  
Communist International.**