

# THE Communist

An Organ of the Third (Communist) International

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

No. 123

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9th, 1922.

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

## Bonar's Wangle Exposed

*Government Scheme to get new Transport System Cheap*

### MAKING UNEMPLOYED BLACKLEGS

[Below we give a speech by our Comrade Newbold which he was unable to deliver in the House of Commons. The Official Labour Party have as little love for the Communist Member as the Capitalist Parties. It is easy for the Speaker to fail to "see" him.]

It was somewhat surprising that there was so little attempt on the part of the spokesmen of the Labour Party, who followed after the Minister of Labour had outlined the policy of the last Government and the programme of the present to alleviate distress, seriously to examine the points of what, from the standpoint of the Government, was an exceptionally fine statement of the case.

Surely they could not have been disappointed? Surely they could not have failed to understand that Sir Montague Barlow and his colleagues are concerned primarily with the defence of the interests of those sections of the propertied class for whom they are briefed?

It is true that the provisions now to be made for ameliorating distress by the finding of work are miserably inadequate to the needs of the situation. But that was to be expected from the custodians of class privilege and of vested interest.

What is this present Government? What are the forces rallied behind the Treasury Bench and below the gangway on that side of the House?

The Government and its majority in this House reflect the interests of the most conservative elements in the British State and Empire. They are a fraction, and no insignificant fraction, of elements now predominant in the social economy and public life of every capitalist country.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that in the last Government, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was always drawn from the Conservative and Unionist ranks. These, the banking and investment corporation interests, took very good care to keep hold of the machinery by which is manipulated the financial policy of the State. The Government has made it a boast that the financial policy followed by the last two Chancellors of the Exchequer has resulted in the public credit (i.e., in Government loans), standing very high at the same time that industrial securities (i.e., money invested in trade and industry—the interests behind Mr. Lloyd George) have suffered.

The present Government, a Government cleansed of the elements supporting Mr. Lloyd George, has been put there by the powers that be to continue this policy and to carry it through entirely free from those checks which it was the aim of Mr. Lloyd George and his friends to impose upon their creditors.

The present Government is a bankers' government, an investment companies' government—to be frank—a pawnbrokers' government.

Government loans now stand very high upon the money market. They are an exceedingly good investment. Their holders

are very happy at this juncture. Who, in the main, are the holders? They are, as is notorious in "the City," the bankers, the insurance companies, the investment trusts.

Now, these are precisely the same interests as hold some four-fifths of all the stock in the railways of this country. Railway



Portrait of a Banker congratulating the electors of Motherwell on their choice

stock is, also, to-day, thanks to the Government policy in endorsing the combination of the several systems into four great groups, about to become operative, another security, another investment which stands high upon the money market.

The railway companies are, by far and away, the biggest and the strongest single interest in British industrialism. In their ownership and on their boards of directors all sections of the property-owning classes join hands.

The big banks, the insurance companies, the investment trusts and the railway groups—those are the massed battalions of money-power in this country.

Those, also, Mr. Speaker, are the interests whose Government is installed upon those benches, thanks to their control not only over these things, but over the main avenues, channels and generators of public opinion.

Now, the great need of British capitalism during the last quarter of a century has been the modernisation of the transport system of this country. Motor traffic has rendered obsolete the wonderful system which between 1740 and 1840, laced this island with a network of roads. Then it must be remembered that this country, being the pioneer in this respect, has the oldest railway system in Europe. There is urgent need of double tracking, stronger bridges and culverts, wider tunnels, electrification, etc.

The canals, again, are obsolete and largely useless.

Roads, railways, canals—all these are in urgent need of renewal, restoration, improvement and extension.

What has stood in the way of all this necessary work being put in hand?

Members opposite will say "the high cost of Labour." Well, gentlemen, it is a fact that the main item of cost in all such big works as these would entail is the wages of general unskilled labour. It is also a fact, a historical fact, that you, your forefathers I should say, improved the parish roads, built the turnpike roads, constructed the canals and, thereafter, the railways by means of the employment of gangs, in some cases huge gangs, of very cheap, very docile (because very helpless) very badly housed and very abominably treated "navvies."

I need not enter into the sordid and miserable details as to the means whereby the great builders and railroad contractors amassed the fabulous fortunes whose by-products now litter the benches opposite.

But, latterly, thanks to facilities for easy emigration and settlement overseas—before you stole all the land in the colonies and in America, by thimble rigging in the Dominions, the Commonwealth and Federal Legislatures—another story I would like to tell, but over which I must draw a veil, a temporary and removable veil—thanks to the work in organising unskilled general labourers, done amidst such difficulty and with such patience and resolution by men like Clynes, Tillett, Bell, O'Grady, Thorne, and last, but not least, Jack Jones, you have not been able to make fortunes and mint millions out of the untold misery of these children of the abyss.

You talk about "the high cost of labour." Yes—but you overcame that difficulty when, in anticipation of the imperialist slaughter of the Great War, you empowered the State to go ahead with Portland, Dover, Rosyth, and yourselves undertook to build Immingham, Fishguard and Heysham harbours.

Before and during the war, thanks to the needs of your defences, it became easier to organise general labour, easier to improve working conditions and to raise wages.

Since the war, however, you have set yourselves to the task, by the machinations of your Federation of British Industries and acting not alone by "private enterprise," but in collusion with the State, through the Ministries of Health and Labour, to break the General Labourers' organisations, to aggravate the consequences of "bad trade," to increase the demoralisation of the unemployed.

To that end you have—pleading economy in one breath and equity in the next—refused to pay men on relief works the rate of wages prevailing in the trade, the trade union rate. You have done that, not so much to penalise the unemployed as to use the unemployed, in their misery and their helplessness, to help you to reduce the trade union rates, to break the trade unions.

(Continued on Page 2, Col. 1)

## Bonar's Wangle Exposed

(Continued from Page 1)

Now, by these your miserably inadequate schemes of relief works, you hope to start a rush from the unions to fight like beasts, like the "navvies" of a generation ago, for a job under any conditions and at any wages.

Sympathy!

I note that your predecessors set up, and you have seen fit to perpetuate two committees. The Lord St. David's Committee on Unemployment Grants—that is one. The Trade Facilities Credits Committee—that is the other. Permit me, Sir, to congratulate the late Government and this Government upon the admirable choice which they made in selecting the chairmen of these Committees.

Let us take first the Committee presided over by Lord St. Davids. It is called the Unemployment Grants Committee. Might I suggest a slight amendment of its designation? Having at its head the chairman of seven or eight of the premier investment trusts of this country—all intent on finding new outlets for their unemployed capital—would it not be more appropriate to name it the Unemployed Capital Grants Committee?

Now to the second committee. Over that committee presides Sir R. M. Kindersley. Truly a most appropriate choice—a choice which, I feel sure, is approved alike by Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Asquith—not to mention the Viscountess Astor.

Sir R. M. Kindersley is the head of Lazard Bros., the international bankers, half of whose capital is held by S. Pearson & Sons, Ltd., the contractors, whose head, Lord Cowdray, supports Mr. Asquith and which used once to, if it does not still, employ Mr. Lloyd George's son. One of his co-directors has the felicity to have the Viscountess Astor for a sister-in-law.

Now this "great financier," Sir Robert Kindersley, has, we have been told this afternoon, sanctioned credits for big tunnelling schemes in London. Did Lazards have a share in finding the money and Pearsons in spending it? If not, what guarantee have we that this will not yet be one of the pleasures of "tranquillity"?

You have idle investment capital. You have unemployed bank deposits. You have plant, seized on mortgages by default, that, now it is in your acquisitive hands, you desire again to set in motion.

Sympathy? Yes, you have plenty of sympathy for the unemployed, for these unemployed, for the unemployed money in your cash boxes, your ledgers and your pockets

(To be continued)

## LEEDS WORKERS' UNION APPRECIATE FIGHTING POLICY

**A**T a meeting of the Leeds District Committee of the Workers' Union on Saturday, 25th November, the following resolution was carried unanimously:—

"That this meeting hails with delight the return to Parliament of over 140 Labour representatives, and records its appreciation of the services rendered by Newbold, Kirkwood and Muir, during the debate on the Address."

For a XMAS PRESENT there is nothing like a Good Book

## THE COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP

AT

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

STOCKS ALL THE BEST BOOKS

Send your Order with price of Book and postage, and we will do the rest

# CHINA TO-DAY

## Capital's Cock-pit or a Communist Granary?

**T**HE economic structure of a country always has a great influence on its social life. In China the peasant class of small landowners is the most important one. It is a characteristic of the peasant class the world over that it is narrow minded and politically inactive. This is especially true in China where a thousand years of tradition form a sort of second nature. If we take into account the crass ignorance of the Chinese peasant, his proverbial resignation, and the influence of the religions which teach him forbearance, we can understand his passivity with its sudden savage movements of revolt, like that of the Boxers.

The Chinese proletariat, numerically, of little importance (2—3 per cent. of the population) is concentrated in a few large centres and consists primarily of unskilled workers: labourers and coolies. The skilled workers form a very weak minority.

It is natural that this proletariat possesses little class consciousness. It is still in the first stages of its development. Unions are being formed; strikes sometimes take place to gain some slight amelioration of conditions from the exploiters. The proletariat does not as yet constitute an active political force.

The bourgeoisie is also weak. It is restricted to internal commerce, all other fields of activity being monopolised by foreign capitalists. That is why the social influence of the Chinese bourgeoisie does not correspond to the capitalist development of China.

A bourgeoisie like that of Europe may be found in the large cities, such as Shanghai, Canton and Hong-Kong; in other places it does not exist.

Finally, there is the infinitesimal class of intellectuals of which the students constitute the vanguard. Their position and their social significance is like that of the Russian intellectuals before 1905. They are too few to have any real importance.

The Chinese bourgeois is still largely provincial. He has no consciousness of national interests. He will defend obstinately the interests of his province, but it is only a few advanced intellectuals, and some enlightened bourgeois of Shanghai or Canton who is concerned with the general interests of the country.

The Chinese bourgeoisie, conscious of its weakness, is politically passive.

We must not forget a very important social group, peculiar to China—the bureaucracy. From time immemorial, it has formed a close caste, living at the expense of the State and monopolising all administrative positions. This bureaucracy has maintained its position till the present day. It has no political character, and is ready to serve anyone who is willing to pay it.

We see then that socially active elements are rare in China. Indifference and passivity are the chief characteristics of Chinese society; which means that any active, organised force can easily rule the country. In China this force is the army. In the past, the army has played a decisive role in all internal revolutions, or rather changes of dynasties. The last dynasties, the Mongols (1280-1368), the Mings (1368-1644), and the Manchus (1644-1911), were overthrown by the army, which still plays an important role in the political life of the country.

The Chinese provincialism is a thing peculiar to that country. The old empire was composed of 22 provinces. Eighteen formed China proper, the other four (Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet and Eastern Turkestan)

were really vassal provinces. These twenty-two provinces were completely autonomous. The distances between them were enormous, the means of communication miserable, travel very difficult; the primitive state of the industries created no interdependence, the ethnographic differences were great. No less than 70 dialects are spoken in contemporary China, 30 of them in China proper.

The government is purely provincial. This is especially noticeable in the administration of the finances and the army. Financially, the province is divided into districts which collect their own taxes, pay their own expenses, and contribute the remainder to the provincial treasury. The provincial administration, once it has covered its costs, sends the remainder to the central government in China. The governor who collects his taxes without too many chicanes, and regularly sends his allotment to the central government, has always been considered a good governor and enjoys complete independence. In the same way the military governor of the province, disposing of provincially maintained forces was, until recently, practically independent from the capital. The imperial dynasty disposed for its defence of a special Manchu army, encamped around Peking.

We see then, that in the ancient empire each province formed an autonomous government. To counter-balance this, the dynasty took care to impose a vigorous separation of the civil and military powers. Each province always had two governors. These were never chosen from the functionaries of the same province, but from a neighbouring province. The civil or military governor maintained his power for only three years in the same place. Several provinces were formed into a vice-kingdom. Under the monarchy there were nine such vice-kingdoms. The Chinese Republic is direct heir of this provincialism which is playing a nefarious role in the civil war now raging in China.

The intervention of foreign capital is one of the most important factors in the social life of China. Before the Revolution, foreign capital, supported by dreadnoughts and expeditionary forces cruelly exploited the Chinese people, and controlled the political life of the country. Chinese and Russian imperialisms were fighting in Northern China, Manchuria and Mongolia. England and the United States occupied the centre and the extreme south. Germany possessed Chang-Tong; France had installed herself a little everywhere, north and centre; Italy wanted her share; Belgium invested in Chinese railways. These capitalist pirates were interested in maintaining the weakness of the Chinese Government. They therefore opposed the creation of a rigorous central power and encouraged provincialism, the quarrels of high functionaries, the intrigues of the various factions.

Japan especially displayed a total absence of scruples. The Tokio Government did not hesitate at any means to prevent the consolidation of the Chinese state. During the dictatorship of Yan-Chi-Kai, Japan exiled the revolutionary leader Sun-Yat-Sen. In 1916 it supported the Republicans of the South against the monarchists of the North, and vice versa in 1917. We may say that there are no purely Chinese movements in the political life of present-day China.

As each event takes place, we should ask: what foreign interests determine these new events? When an insurrection, or a change of government takes place, we may be sure that some foreign group of capitalists believes that it can thereby achieve its ends.

NOW READY

PLEBS TEXTBOOKS: No. 2

## AN OUTLINE OF MODERN IMPERIALISM

A Concise History of the International Politics of the Great Grab Powers, 1880-1922

Written for the man with only limited leisure for study

With Maps, Glossary, full Index, and Foreword by George Hicks (A.U.B.T.W.)

2s. 6d. (post paid 2s. 9d.). Special Terms for Quantities

PLEBS LEAGUE, 162a, Buckingham Palace Road, London, S.W.1

# Irish Free State Bill

## COMMUNISTS IN COMMONS MOVE ITS REJECTION

[In the House of Commons Comrade Saklatvala moved and Comrade Newbold seconded the rejection of the Bill ratifying the Constitution of the Irish Free State as adopted by the "Provisional Parliament of Southern Ireland." They received no support, and the Bill passed accordingly. Comrade Saklatvala's speech is given below.]

**I** REALISE the unpopularity I am courting in taking this step, but it was distinctly understood between my electors and myself that they did not wish me to back up a Treaty which was based upon coercion and was signed under duress.

I do not now speak on behalf of the Labour Party in the House. I wish that to be made perfectly clear.

I maintain that, perhaps as a purist, I adhere in the Amendment to a principle that the Labour Party has laid down, namely, the principle of self-determination. It is not to be understood that I do not share the wishes or the prayers of my chief, nor is it to be understood I have not the same desire of my colleagues, but I must frankly admit that I do not share their hopes. I believe that the only cure will come when either this Government or a future Labour Government tells our friends in Ireland that they have a right to a genuine and *bona fide* self-determined voice of their own. Unless that is done, neither the Treaty nor the Constitution nor the Bill now before the House is likely to do what we all, against our convictions, hope that they may do.

We talk of a Treaty. Hon Members on all sides of the House have written and spoken in unmistakeable terms in expressing their views that the unfortunate part of the Treaty was that the signatures were obtained under duress. I feel that that duress was undoubtedly there, and the unfortunate fact was that it need not have been there. If matters had been left to the free will and the good sense of the people, the result would have been quite different from what it has been.

We have heard to-day quotations and illustrations of similar enactments for colonies and dominions of the Empire. Is there any real parallel between those Constitutions and the hopes and desires of the people of the countries concerned and the hopes and desires of the Irish people?

Was Australia not rejoicing and waiting almost to a man and woman for the day when her Constitution would be confirmed by this House?

Was not South Africa, after a great war and defeat, gratefully awaiting the day when the Treaty would be passed and the little minority of republicans in a consti-

tutional manner would be permitted to express themselves as a minority?

The people of Canada, too, were determined to have their Constitution and to work it.

The case of Ireland is different. It is no use our pretending it is not so. We cannot adopt the policy that by driving deeper into the soil the roots of a cactus, and by carefully covering it with soil, roses will grow later on.

Was there ever an instance in the histories of treaties where immediately after a treaty had been signed, two out of the five signatories had to repudiate their signatures as not having been put down with a bona fide and conscientious intention?

What is the constituent assembly which has sent us this document? Soon after the Treaty (and, apart from anything that was ever contemplated at the time of the

### CONTROL COMMISSION

The Control Commission (comrades J. Braddock, H. W. Inkpin and E. Lismer) set up by the Battersea Congress for the purpose of reviewing the management of Party Finance and the conduct of Party business, will hold its first meeting on Saturday, December 16th. H. W. Inkpin is acting as Secretary to the Commission, and all communications for the Commission should be addressed to him at 16, King Street, London, W.C. 2.

Treaty), a truce was entered into between the two factious parties in Ireland creating an artificial Dail to tackle the problem of the Treaty.

I take no sides with either of the Irish parties, but I maintain that truce—or that promise to observe a truce—was not fair to the people of Great Britain, and it was certainly more than unfair to the people of Ireland.

Under the truce it was decided to call an artificial constituent assembly, and when the moment came, even that truce was not observed, and the so-called constituent assembly cannot on any *bona fide* and sincere principle of self-determination, be accepted as a truly and properly elected Dail representing the people of Ireland in the ratios and the proportions in which they stand.

I was present at the last great Labour Conference in Ireland; I attended its sittings in Dublin and I saw there written down in black and white and heard proclaimed from the platform:—"A plague on both your houses"—on both parties, both the pro-Treaty and the anti-Treaty party.

I have heard it declared that Irish Labour, well organised, is determined to

work for a Workers' Republic. These are the views that are being expressed, and the Labour Party in Ireland is bound to come into its own, however much hon. Members may jeer and laugh.

The Republicans are there: it is no use denying that they are there in very large numbers, and it is extremely doubtful, if coercive measures were not taken, whether they would not prove themselves to be the majority of the people of Ireland.

These facts cannot be ignored, and they cannot be buried or covered up.

We are assured by the Prime Minister that, according to Mr. Cosgrave, Ireland is only waiting for the Constitution to be carried through this House, and that they are going to work it out.

Mr. Cosgrave knows that he had to shoot four human beings a week ago, and he has had since to take another life by violence—that of Erskine Childers.

He knows that the prisons of Ireland are to be filled with thousands of men, and even some women, without charge and without trial.

He knows that Ireland is to be prepared to receive this Constitution, not with joy and flags and illuminations, but with martial law, penalties and threats, imprisonment and ships waiting to depopulate the country. (Interruption.)

I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, to save me from those who are pretending to be my friends. I appeal to the Prime Minister and I appeal to the House.

Once, in 1801, our predecessors and your forefathers thought they had worked a great political trick and a mighty political charm when with great unanimity in Dublin and London they brought about the Act of Union. For 120 years that Act of Union has only produced distress to Ireland and disgrace to this country.

I, as your friend—not as your critic nor as your opponent—feel that I am in conscience bound not to be a party to another and a greater mockery.

I am speaking in a most difficult position. I know I seem to be the friend of my enemies and the enemy of my friends, but time and history will prove my case.

I shall not be at all sorry or ashamed to say that even if you were all unanimous, I stood aloof and away from you.

Within five years this house will find the necessity for undoing this unanimous or semi-unanimous Act after more distress and more suffering.

Let me predict that it will be the Labour Party sitting on those benches which will have to afford real freedom to Ireland. Instead of merely expressing a pious opinion, I take my courage in my hands and true to my convictions I move this amendment in order to create an opportunity for myself to vote against the Bill.

### That "Red Plot"

#### Lansbury denounces Government Spy System

**T**HE endeavour of Bonar Law to discredit the unemployed marchers (whom he refuses to see) by pretending that the march was a Communist Plot to create riot, was appropriately denounced in the House of Commons. His particularly mean and cowardly endeavour to discredit them by their police-court records received condemnation from a succession of speakers led by Commander Kenworthy and George Lansbury. The late Editor of the *Daily Herald* said (among other things) that he wanted to join in the protest against carrying on these bad old traditions of the War.

I have been in politics almost ever since I was a child, and I have never known a time when the police have been so active in regard to trade unions and socialist societies as they are now.

I have never read at any time such outrageous and ridiculous stories of the aims and objects of trade unions and socialist societies as now.

It is an insult to the whole of the Labour movement to send police of all kinds to take down our speeches in a very rough-and-ready manner.

I was sent to prison for a speech that I never delivered. (Laughter.)

It is all very well for hon. Members to laugh. I can laugh because it did me no harm. I can go to prison and come out and it will not make any difference to me, but I am not a poor man in the sense that other people are poor, people who have no one to speak for them, and who very often are unable to speak for themselves.

It is not a matter for laughter when police who cannot write shorthand are sent to our meetings to take down notes and to publish them in the Press, prosecute the men, and send them to prison.

I undertake to say that not one of the men whom you charge with having gone to prison for seditious statements ever uttered the statements that the police charged them with having made. I am as certain of that as I am that I am standing here.

Ninety per cent. of these men whom you dub criminals are men who went through the War. One of those who want to see you has every medal except the Victoria

Cross. He has gone through the length and breadth of Europe fighting for his country. The others fought too.

If even ten per cent. of them—which is untrue—could be proved to be real criminals in the ordinary sense of the word, you have no right to gibbet them in the Press in the fashion in which you did.

I think that you have done one of the cruellest injustices to a set of very poor men who are down and out, and I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will say to-night that a mistake has been made, and that we are not to condemn 2,000 men in this fashion simply because they have among them some people who probably at some time did what they ought not to have done.

Who has not? God forbid that I should pass judgment on anybody except myself.

You often talk in this House of sympathy. You often say that we have not a monopoly. Let all of us agree that, whether these men are good men or bad men, they are suffering through an infernal social condition which ought to have been changed years ago.

Above all, do not let the Government of the day libel them and lampoon them in the fashion in which they have done.



## UNEMPLOYMENT IN AUSTRALIA

The Governmental Press are working full time in their endeavour to persuade the Unemployed and others that Bonar Law & Co. are about to tackle the problem as never before. Part of this process of dissimulation and deception consists in the pretence that the unemployed exist because of Communist propaganda. Part of the "ameliorative measures" suggested is emigration. The following statement which the Labour Council of New South Wales, Australia, have asked us to publish, will nail down both the lie and the fraud. Unemployment exists in Australia, notwithstanding its distance from centres of Bolshevik agitation. Emigration to Australia is a Boss-class device to beat down wages, irrespective of the consequences in increased unemployment, there and here.

THE British Government, acting in conjunction with the Federal and State Governments in Australia, has for some time past been subsidising the shipment of large numbers of unemployed British workers to Australia.

According to the latest unemployment returns of the Commonwealth Government Statistician, printed in the Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics, Bulletin No. 88, June, 1922, the percentage of trade union members returned as unemployed is as follows:—

State	End of 1912	End of 1920	End of 1921	End of 2nd Qr. 1922
New South Wales	5.0	6.9	11.2	11.4
Victoria	6.7	7.3	5.2	7.8
Queensland	4.6	16.3	11.3	7.7
South Australia	5.1	5.1	6.1	6.4
West Australia	5.8	4.8	8.0	11.4
Tasmania	3.4	3.0	16.7	10.4

Commonwealth ..... 5.6 7.8 9.5 9.6

According to conservative official figures there are approximately 70,000 trade unionists out of work, apart from the large numbers of unemployed not yet organised in unions, which will bring the figure up to considerably over 100,000 Unemployed in Australia.

Under these circumstances the action of the British and Australian Governments in inducing large numbers of British workmen to break up their homes and undertake the long journey to Australia, constitutes a cruel confidence trick upon the workers of Britain, designed to benefit the Australian Employers at the expense of the British and Australian workers.

Thousands of deluded British workers are to-day vainly seeking work throughout Australia, swelling the ranks of the unemployed, and increasing the existing heavy burdens of the organised workers.

In Australia to-day, the workers are sustaining shock after shock from the attacks of the employers on hours and wages. Already the State and Federal Governments and the Arbitration Courts are working overtime, turning out legislation and awards for lower wages and longer hours.

The industrial situation throughout the Commonwealth is in a state of chronic unrest, and it is a cold-blooded crime for those who are fully aware of the situation to flood the already over-stocked labour market with large numbers of immigrant workers from Britain.

The object of this act on the part of the British Government is clear and unmistakable; it is to side-step its fulsome war promises of a "land fit for heroes," and to relieve the appalling industrial crisis, directly attributable to the most infamous war ever perpetrated upon mankind, and to the no less infamous and predatory "Peace" Treaties.

The Labour Council of New South Wales therefore requests all British Labour organisations, to whom this circular is addressed, to lose no time in placing before their members the true facts concerning the industrial situation in Australia.

# "PEACE and BREAD"

Karl Radek explains the Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia

## WHAT THE NEAR EAST PROBLEM MEANS TO THE WORKERS' STATE

### Credits to Russia will give Bread to British Unemployed

A STARING poster asked us a few days ago: "Who is Karl Radek?" The *Manchester Guardian* has helped those whom the question mystified to answer the question. Following upon his success in obtaining an interview with Lenin, the special correspondent of that journal has secured an article in which Karl Radek (the most brilliant journalist in the ranks of the Communist International) explains the foreign policy of Soviet Russia.

### "Peace and Bread"

His message may be summarised in one sentence: "Russia has no other end than the conquest of peace and bread."

Radek makes clear that the nature of world society is such that no one state or nation can secure either bread or peace without the cordial co-operation of its neighbours.

When the one state is a Workers' Republic seeking to keep alive in a world of Capitalist states, the consequences are (as the history of the Soviet Republic shows) that the irrepressible class-struggle between the working mass and the exploiting few is raised to its highest power and expressed as a national fight of the proletarian state against a world alliance of the Bourgeois communities.

### Europe Wrecked

From its birth in 1917 the Soviet Republic endeavoured to force by means of pressure from the toiling masses, each of the then contending Governments to end the bloody struggle and begin negotiations for a world peace.

I do not think (says Radek) that there is now a man in Europe, even among the leaders of the victorious Powers, who considers that these Powers gained from the fact that (describing them as treachery) they rejected our offers.

From the world-war American capital alone issued a victor, and victorious Europe stands, without allies in Europe, and with overstrained forces, face to face with a tremendous commercial and political competitor.

Victorious France can give orders to Germany and can advance her regiments to the Rhine. But she cannot thereby secure either the restoration of Northern France or peace. She can merely secure the destruction of Germany and the beginning of heroic efforts on the part of England to create a Continental coalition against her.

I doubt if there is a single one of the present European rulers who is glad of the complete destruction of equilibrium in Europe caused by the fact that the Allies wished to fight to the end, not imagining what sort of end it was to be.

### Communist Realism

From the first the rulers of the Soviet Republic realised that, placed as they were, their immediate needs demanded some concessions to capitalist interests in order to cut the ground from under the feet of the active interventionist cliques. They understood clearly that not a sudden leap but a process of historical development was necessary before the victorious workers could reap the full fruits of their victory.

When now (says Radek) people explain things by saying that we, having lost faith in Communism, are prepared to make concessions to world capital, you know that they are talking rubbish.

Even in the first days of our victory we were realists enough to understand that even if the transition from the present capitalist system in which gain rules to a system based on labour will not last so long as the transition from the feudal system to the capitalist system, none the less, on a world scale, there must be a very long period during which a *modus vivendi* must be found between the countries of victorious labour and those of a ruling bourgeoisie.

### At long last—Peace!

But Bourgeois Europe would have no concessions:—

Two years of bitter struggle passed by, two years during which England, France and America struggled for our destruction, thinking that it was enough to blow up a thousand bridges, to flood the mines of the Donetz basin and Baku, in order to make Russia more capable of paying the bills presented by foreign ex-holders of private property in Russia.

Soviet Russia conquered, but, regardless of this, she never for a single moment was carried away by her victory.

She understood perfectly how necessary peace was to the Russian masses, how many years of stiff labour were necessary to secure for the Russian peasant and the Russian workman the conditions of civilised life.

Only with our victory over Wrangel did we succeed in ensuring actual peace, although to this very day that is not confirmed by peace treaty with the Great Powers of Western Europe and Europe.

### Russia's need of Britain

Particularly with Britain did the Soviet Republic endeavour to obtain a real peace—with its concomitant economic interchange and communication.

The reason Radek gives frankly—"because economically Britain is the strongest Power in Europe, and because she could help to an infinite extent in the restoration of Russian economy."

Seeking peace with England we knew also that we could give England a great deal, for we knew how burdensome it was for England to be dependent on American sources of raw material, we knew how badly England needed new distributing markets in order to get through the crisis caused by the results of the war.

### The Near East Clash

Events in the Near East have brought Britain and Russia once again to the point at which it is impossible to ignore the fact that the future of the world depends upon the nature of the settlement between them. Radek thus explains the attitude of the Soviet Power:—

Russia is not only a European but also an Asiatic country.

Asiatic questions have been for centuries the source of prolonged conflicts between England and Russia. We have renounced the Tsarist policy of robbery with regard to the Asiatic peoples, but naturally we have not been able to declare that we do not interest ourselves in questions concerning them.

Your Government concluded with the Tsar's Government a treaty concerning the partition of Persia, whereas we have renounced special rights in Northern Persia. But we cannot be indifferent to the question whether, as a neighbour for Baku, we have a Persian Government or an English occupation disguised with a facade of a Persian Government.

### Persia—and Oil!

It cannot be a matter of indifference to us whether in the neighbourhood of Baku are the troops of Riza Khan or an English Expeditionary Corps, for *Persia and Riza Khan will not fight for Baku oil, whereas Royal Dutch and Shell are licking their lips for it.*

From the moment when we concluded the trade agreement with England Lord Curzon has showered upon us papers of protest with regard to action by us alleged to be directed against England over the whole extent of Asia.

We have always made the same reply: "Be so good as to tell us in what consist the interests of England in Persia, Afghanistan, and Turkey. Be so good as to come to terms with us as to which of our interests in these countries will be taken into account by England."

But to all our demands we have received no answer of any kind. Lord Curzon contented himself with his notes of protest and did not reply, even when we proved to him that his protest was based on false documents cooked up by the agents of the German Secret Service who were seeking additional earnings in pounds sterling.

### Curzon earns Curses

This policy ended—you know how—in the fall of English prestige in Persia, it ended in the bankruptcy of English policy in the Near East.

We observe this without malicious glee, but (I do not hide it) with a joy of which it is possible to speak publicly, since we do not consider that the interests of the English people demanded that its Government would establish a feeling of ceaselessly growing hatred of the name of England (of a country which could contribute so very much to the youthful, developing peoples of the East). English public opinion declares that it is necessary to liquidate the policy of struggle with Turkey, the policy of destroying Turkey.

### Russia's tie with Turkey

We can but rejoice at this, for we know that Turkey needs peace, and we know that renunciation of the policy of enslaving Turkey gets rid of one of the reasons of conflicts between England and Russia.

Our relation to the peoples of the East and Turkey is not one of romantic sentimentalism. The capitalist world, at Genoa, put demands before us which amounted to the introduction into Russia of the system of capitulations and of "Dettes publiques russes." How can you be surprised that we consider ourselves at one with those who have suffered for hundreds of years under the regime of capitulations and for tens of years under the regime of the "Dettes publiques ottomanes?"

Our relations with the East are based on the fact that the poor and hungry are stronger when they are united, and the peoples of the East and the peoples of Russia are alike poor and hungry.

### Britain Crushing Russia Out

But (Radek continues) is there any hope that the change of British policy towards Turkey will bring near a settlement between Britain and Russia? The Allies only abandon the policy of Gladstone towards Turkey to resume that of Beaconsfield towards Russia. Even Japan was invited to the conference on Near Eastern affairs, while in their note of Sept. 23rd to Turkey, the Allies excluded Soviet Russia.

Only after our emphatic protests they persuaded themselves, by looking at the map, that we were a Black Sea power and invited us to Lausanne as unpaid consultants.

We ask ourselves: "Is England accessory to the attempt to exclude us from the settlement of the vital interests of the Russian people in the Near East?" and to this question we reply: "Not merely is she accessory, she is the instigator of this exclusion."

Since the English Fleet is stronger than the French, it is obvious that the Straits will be in English hands, if they are to be in the hands of the Allies, even if this should be under the flag of the League of Nations.

### What the Straits Mean

We are for the freedom of the Straits. The Straits are the road by which in the future the Black Sea nations are going to export their bread and oil and import European goods. Russia has lost Riga and Reval, and Russia desires to be free to make use of Odessa, Novorossisk, and Batum. On the Black Sea there are no considerable forces of war (naval forces), and if the great Western European Powers do not force their way into the Black Sea and light the

## HUNGER MARCH TO THE LAND OF PLENTY

WE have through weary, sullen days trod the dreary miles between our homes and far famed London.

We have been footsore and lame, but are not halting in our determination to make those who rule this land give ear to our demands.

We are not suppliants: we are portents. We will not beg: we will not be denied.

We may be barred by serried rows of armed police from presenting ourselves before our rulers, but—

No barrier blinds our eyes to the wealth so profusely displayed when pomp and panoply accompany the King to open his Parliament.

We travel with open eyes the promenades of the well-to-do. We see the wares that such as we have toiled to make, displayed to tempt an already sated appetite, and we think of the starving misery in the homes from which we come.

We see the busy rush of the idle, parasitical horde on their way from pleasure to pleasure, and we remember the fireless homes, the ill-clad children, the wan and weary wives who wait our coming home again.

We are lodged in workhouses and marshalled by Police.

We are traduced and slandered in a callous, cruel Press.

Our constitutional plea is acclaimed a conspiratorial plot.

The loathsome spies and secret service sneaks dog our footsteps.

The Prime Minister of this great country defiles his office by garnering garbage for the grinning ghoul of the Gutter Press.

The Prime Minister fears to face us.

Why does he fear us? Are we not men? All our lives (when permitted) we toiled for such as he.

Time was, and not so long ago, when our bodies were his protection.

Now we seek to voice the claims of two millions like ourselves.

The outcasts from industry, we have wants. We dare not supply them.

We can work. Our masters say, No!

Shall we continue to waste and wither away? Will we go as empty as we came?

Shall our pitiable patience much longer endure?

Or shall we, like a poor blind Samson of another day, destroy their filthy temple?

Who knows? Who knows?

Look well to your gates, my masters!

"For many a gilded tower,  
And many a palace steep,  
Shall tremble in that hour,  
When Labour wakes from sleep."

### OUR PAPER

The future of the Party to-day lies in our paper.

The paper is the means to build up the Party. It is the means to reach out to the masses outside the Party. It is the means to weld together our forces in the common fight.

Only by the active co-operation of the whole membership will this be accomplished.

The paper will have to be written by the active half of the whole membership, so that it will reveal and organise our struggle in every phase and locality.

It will have to be sold by the active work of our whole membership, so that the selling of every copy is an act of propaganda and every reader won is a real strengthening of our army.

The first and immediate thing we can do is to organise ourselves for selling the paper AS A PARTY.

We need to build up a strong network of distribution so that our message can in the shortest time reach out to the widest circle of the masses.

It means organising ourselves for the job, grouping ourselves in our street or in our workshop or in our trade union branch for selling the paper with team work.

COMRADES, ALL HANDS TO THE WORK OF SELLING THE PAPER.

Detailed instructions on the steps to take will be sent out immediately.

flames there the Black Sea will be a corner of the world secure from the conflagrations of war. The Black Sea will be a single great harbour for all the Black Sea peoples.

If the English Government demands the handing over of the guarding of the Straits to England and France under cover of the League of Nations, then we say, "The Allies are destroying the freedom of the Straits as a trade route."

### Turkey no Danger

Russia does not fear to leave the Straits in Turkish hands:—

The peasant masses of Turkey are awakened by the war, and they will thank Allah if they can live in peace. The Government of Kemal Pasha performed a miracle in organising the defence of its country after so many years of war, but it could perform this miracle only because it was calling these masses to the defence of their own hearths.

We do not threaten these hearths, and never shall threaten them, and therefore we not only do not fear the hostility of Turkey but are convinced that the Turkish popular masses, together with the Russian popular masses, will be the basis of firm friendly relations between two nations.

The *Manchester Guardian* quite rightly pointed out that having regard to the present state of military technique and to the rôle of aeroplane and submarine boats, whatever might be the decision of the Dardanelles questions, much would depend upon whether or no Turkey is to be forced one-sidedly to agree to a considerable reduction of her forces.

### Must it be War?

We do not seek the honour of sitting at the same table with Lord Curzon, but the opportunity of influencing the decision of the fates of the Straits in the interests of Russia.

The absence of Russia from this decision will destroy the significance of whatever agreement may be reached.

*We shall not sign a treaty that contradicts the interests of Russia, and anyone who is prepared to decide this question in despite of Russian interests should know that to do this is to prepare a basis for new struggles and further conflicts.*

### Soviet Submarines?

We do not flourish our weapons, but we firmly declare to the whole world that September 23rd, the day when we learnt of the attempt to exclude Russia from the decision of this question so vital to her, merely because at the present moment she is unable to send twenty submarines to the Straits and a squadron of aeroplanes, will be the day of a turning point in Russia's consciousness.

*If we are forced to it, we shall work, if necessary many years, to make Russia no longer defenceless at sea.* We have the more right to say this quietly because everyone knows how badly we want peace. Everyone knows that our offer in Genoa of a reduction of armaments was a sincere offer, based on the interests of the huge masses of peasantry and of the working class. But just as we were forced to take up rifles, so we may be taught to build submarines.

### The Urquhart Agreement

After what I have said above, there is surely no need for me to add much more about the fact that we could not ratify the agreement with Urquhart at the very moment when the English Government said to us: "Your attempts to arrange peaceful relations with England are in vain. You are throwing your concessions and your compromises into empty air. We do not wish to consider the interests of Russia, nor shall we consider them."

We should be children if we were to try to believe that it is possible to strengthen business

(Continued on Page 8)

## Will he keep this up?

Maiden speech of J. W. Muir (Labour Member for Maryhill, Glasgow) during the Unemployment Debate

I HAVE been watching the occupants of the Government Benches very closely to-day, and I am in a dilemma to know whether it is callousness that causes the grin to appear on their faces, or whether it is lack of understanding.

There have been jokes passed here; there has been occasion for laughter both for ourselves and for those opposite, but it seems to me there has been both a lack of understanding and sheer brutal callousness on the Government side. No one who understands the condition of the country to-day, who can feel and appreciate the hardships and privations of the common people, could allow a flip-pant mood to overcome him, yet I have seen on one or two faces opposite a continual grin.

I want to put it to the House that the question of unemployment is not one which solely affects the unemployed man and his dependants. The 1918 Education Act was probably one of the best Education Acts we ever had in Great Britain. Had it been passed in its entirety it might have done great things. But at the time there was need of economy. There was a fear of increasing expenditure, and the operation of certain Sections of the Act was consequently postponed for a period of three years. That period of three years expired last year, but the Sections are not yet operating.

Had those Sections been operating, you would have prevented one of the tragedies of the present crisis, one of the tragedies on the rising generation. You would have made it possible to keep boys and girls at school till they were 15; you would have made it possible for boys and girls to get their education continued in day continuation schools. But it was going to cost money, and you were more concerned about economy and the saving of money.

I see the grin appears on one face again. *One can understand a grinning ape, but one cannot understand a grinning human when there is poverty and destitution and hardship.* [HON. MEMBERS: "Order, order!"]

I am not withdrawing anything. Had those Sections been put into operation you would have kept at school those boys and girls who to-day are running the streets wild, learning bad habits at the most impressible period of their lives, when their characters are being formed. It is all on the plea of economy, on the plea of keeping down expenditure.

Then take the case of the middle-aged man, who has worked steadily for 30, 40, or 45 years. There are many of them that I know personally in Glasgow who have never been out of the one employment for 25 and 30 years, and now they have been out of employment for two years without a break. It cannot be said that they have been indifferent to their work, indifferent to their employers' interests, or they would not have been in employment for 25 or 30 years under the one management. These men have been out of employment now, many of them for two years, and others for 18 months. Do you think that these men will be able to go back to their employment and put into it the same skill that they previously possessed? No.

If there is going to be any revival of trade we know what to expect. We know the pace is going to be more killing than it ever was before. The competition in the world's markets is so bitterly keen to-day that the demand for increased production and output will be greater and stronger and more irresistible than ever it has been, and the struggle for these men to keep the pace and the fear of being thrown out of employment will send tens of thousands of them to early graves. Is there no tragedy in all that?

It has been stated that the War and the peace are responsible for the present situation. I am only prepared to agree to that in the matter of time.

It is true that in the matter of time the War and the peace are responsible for the two million unemployed that we have to-day, but had there been no war, 10, 12 or 15 years hence we should have had exactly the crisis that is facing us to-day, and all that the War and the peace have done is to accelerate the speed at which our powers of production were increasing until we have reached the point that the world's needs can be supplied in such a short space of time that there is no possibility of any permanent revival of trade.

There is no possible hope of any prosperity for the common people of Britain again on the old lines—absolutely none. We have reached a point now where, instead of the markets of the world broadening out for us, they are narrowing. All these people we previously had the advantage of supplying with manufactured products are to-day in

## How Labour Lost and Won in Wales

UNLIKE other parts of the country, Wales has returned a majority of Labour representatives to Westminster. Practically all the victories were secured in the mining divisions, which supported Labour *en bloc*, each one of the Labour candidates receiving an average majority of nearly 5,000. Such was King Coal's reply to King Capital!

The rural areas, in the main, remained Liberal, dividing their support between the two Liberal wings. Still, the appreciable minorities secured by Labour in some of the agricultural constituencies indicates that the day is coming when those sons of the soil will demand something more tangible than a Land Song.

Tory support was chiefly obtained in the seaport towns, such as Cardiff, Barry and Newport, where Labour was rather badly beaten. Here—especially in Cardiff—Labour is opposed on the one hand by a strong business vote (linked to which is an army of clerical and managerial flunkies); and, on the other hand, by a demoralised working-class element—the slum proletariat.

In Newport, with no Liberal in the field, Labour (we are told) "banked on the hope of securing the bulk of the recent Liberal vote." The result showed an increased Tory majority. If this defeat will help to disillusion the Labour Party regarding Liberal aid, it may be yet regarded as a forerunner of victory.

Lloyd George was decidedly at a discount, and his pilgrimage proved to be a hopeless fiasco. It cut no ice. Having relieved himself of two of his railway station stump speeches, at Pontypool and Cardiff, David appropriately opened his Circus at Bridgend, under the shadow of the Mental Asylum.

There he cadged votes for Vernon Hartshorn's opponent, a Liberal schoolmaster, who gave nightly demonstrations to the miners of mid-Glamorgan of the intellectual bankruptcy of Capitalism.

From Bridgend the ex-Premier went to Aberavon and Neath to speak for his two lieutenants, Jack and Hugh Edwards, who were ignominiously defeated. His message at Llanelli, Carnarvon, Wrexham, etc., was followed similarly—by Labour gains. Verily, David has met with something stronger than Goliath!

The prime lesson of the Election has been the futility of pursuing a half-hearted policy. Labour's success in Wales is to be measured by its aggressiveness. Barker, the veteran miners' rebel-leader, was returned unopposed, while it is freely admitted that Wallhead would have hardly won at Merthyr had he been less militant.

Watts Morgan, in East Rhondda, provides an example of a different type. There, notwithstanding the moderation, the Methodism, and the military record of the

gallant Major, an imported Liberal nonentity polled upwards of 14,000 votes—in a constituency which has had a miners' representative for nearly 40 years.

The outstanding feature in most of the divisions where Labour suffered defeat, was the mild nature of the campaign. Strenuous attempts were made to win the middle-class vote; to show that the Labour programme tallied with the tenets of Christianity, and that the candidates were "jolly good patriots."

The enemy did not commit that mistake. Safe of the business vote, it Rolls-Roystered the slums, conscious of the slump in the religious market, it promised cheap beer. Most ironical of all, while Labour spokesmen repudiated connection with the workers of other lands, Tory shipowners busily canvassed the "coloured" vote.

Labour should realise, once and for all, that the bulk of the people are not religious, but decidedly irreligious. What does it concern the penniless proletariat whether the Labour programme has received the blessing of, say, the Archdeacon of Tory Pwhip. The "man-in-the-street" is not interested in reconciling working-class policy with high moral ideas. Rather, he has a growing suspicion that the morals of Archdeacons are sometimes a bit too "high."

Vote cadging among the well-to-do proved to be a ludicrous failure. In some divisions Suburbia was made the objective point. Scholarly appeals were made by University lecturers to the pockets of the small plutocrats—demonstrating the blushing innocence of Labour's proposals. But the response was meagre. A spineless policy of Pensions for Everybody and Taxes for Nobody cannot appeal to anybody that is somebody.

The verdict of the Welsh workers upon the non-class elements, presumably headed by Lord Kimberley, was nothing if not decisive. The 18 new members—with about 2 exceptions—had been definitely engaged in the workers' industrial struggle, while nearly all the defeated candidates were of a different type. Among the latter we find an ironmaster, a clergyman, 3 barristers, and 3 ex-school-teachers.

And the verdict of the workers was not altogether unsound. It showed a healthy distrust of any salvation imposed from above. The workers' cause will not depend upon the middle-class vote; neither can it be trusted to be championed by middle-class representatives. The middle-class attitude, from the mediæval knight to the modern cheesemonger, has been one long series of vacillations. Labour's chances of winning suburban support must be very remote; even when it is won it is comparatively unreliable.

MERVYN.

the position not only of supplying their own needs, but of creating a surplus which is placed on the world's markets in competition with ours, and that is a fact we have to face.

Had the War not come at all we should have had, perhaps not in our generation, but in the time of those children we are coming after us, this crisis to face unless we scrapped the present system.

Britain is never again going to be in the prosperous position that she previously occupied. Perhaps I may be allowed to support what I am stating, and what I have said for years, by the words of Mr. J. M. Keynes, a gentleman known by most of the Government representatives.

He has stated that Britain is a decaying society to-day, and he is no more optimistic in the matter than I am. He states that the unemployment figures of to-day are almost equivalent, so far as he can see, to the surplus population over the census figures of 1911.

Do hon. Members know what that means?

It means that there are 2,000,000 men and their dependants who are surplus to-day under existing conditions, and under such conditions there can be no steady employment for those two millions. They must become permanent casual labourers, some in to-day, out to-morrow. It means a change in the personnel of the unemployed army, but the extent of it always about the same.

I am more optimistic than Mr. Keynes. His suggestion is that the remedy is to stabilise the standard of comfort where it is.

What does that mean for the unemployed man? What does it mean for those who are working for wages at the 1914 level?

*It means stabilising their standard of life where it is now, and leaving the gentlemen of the Government and the class they represent with their Rolls Royces and all their condition of wealth.*

We are not going to tolerate it.

If you ignore the unemployment problem, if you do not tackle it; if you do not realise all that tragedy of which I have spoken and which I have tried to show, do not imagine that it is merely going to affect the unemployed and the common workers.

If you have made up your minds that the only way in which you can tackle the question is by still further forcing down the standard of living of the common workers, let me warn you—I am not threatening—that you are going to be dragged down with them into a holocaust in which all will be overcome.

DECEMBER PLEBS 48 pp., 6d.

Special Article with 3 Maps

THE OPENING-UP OF CHINA

A Study in Modern Imperialism

Also "A Frustrated Poet," by R. W. Postgate, and numerous other Articles, Reviews, &c., of interest to workers.

PLEBS, 162a, Buckingham Palace Rd., London, S.W. 1



# Labour Party Refuse United Front

## Statement by the Communist Party Executive

**T**HE Leaders of the Labour Party still refuse to recognise the imperative need for a united working front.

Intoxicated with success at the polls, and overburdened with the importance of acting as His Majesty's opposition, they have recommended the Party to reject the application sent in by Newbold for the Labour Party whip.

Naturally the question arises—what will the Communist Party do? Will the futility of seeking an alliance with a body that has rejected their overtures, time and time again, force them to alter their policy to one of definite opposition to the Labour Party?

To this there can be only one answer. It is not the conduct of the Labour Party Leaders, but the needs of the workers in their every-day struggle that decides the policy of the Communist Party, and, as a solid front of the working-class is even more necessary now, when the workers are broken by defeat, than it was when the capitalist offensive began, the C.P. will pursue the course it has followed for the past two years.

We will continue to support the Labour Party. But, even while we say this, we warn the workers that only disappointment can follow if they look to that Party for emancipation.

The Party of the future is the C.P.

The more the Labour Party seems to succeed the more it will fail.

Already some of those who, flushed with the General Election victory, proudly stepped forward to wage war against capitalism, look listless and dull, and move about with a heavy feeling that all is not right. The hope of achieving anything is much further away than it seemed to be at the declaration of the poll. Already their illusions are slipping away from them. Soon also the workers will lose theirs.

One by one they will be torn from them until, their eyes cleared from the fogs of reformism, they clearly see the revolutionary path as the only way out of the capitalist wilderness.

In the meantime (while we never halt our efforts to organise a fighting revolutionary army in preparation for the struggle that is ahead) we must keep the ranks closed against capitalism.

The C.P. can submit its every act during the past two years to the judgment of the working class, without fear of the verdict. The capitalist class and its hireling Press have launched attack after attack upon us: the Courts and prisons have been used continuously against our members: all pretence of justice has been cynically abandoned in the effort to crush the C.P., but, in spite of it all, we can stand before the workers, employed and unemployed, with a clear conscience, knowing that we have never failed them in the fight.

When the offensive was opened against the Miners, we were with them and remained with them to the end. We saw from the start of the fight that the only hope of victory for the miners was in getting all the other workers on the field. The united front at that time would have broken capitalism for good, and the wretched history of the past two years would never have been written.

The C.P. did its best to achieve it. The story of its efforts may be read by any worker in the long series of persecutions instituted by the Government and by the long roll of members who had to spend weary months in prison.

The failure of the leaders to unite, played into the hands of the enemy and brought disaster to the miners. One after another the disunited workers were attacked. One after another they suffered defeat, till the final collapse came with the breaking of the engineers.

Using every effort to get unity on the industrial front, the Communist Party did not neglect the Parliamentary front. Hence our insistence in approaching the Labour Party and demanding affiliation as a bona fide working-class organisation. Hence also the application of Newbold for the Labour Party whips. The urgent need of the workers is the closest possible unity. This can only be attained if those who claim to be leaders of the workers are united in action. Therefore we take this opportunity of again demonstrating to the conscious workers of the country that it is the leaders of the Labour Party who make unity of action impossible.

Newbold has served the Labour Movement in this country faithfully and well for a long number of years.

His name is known to every worker as a stern fighter of capitalism and a source of strength to every section of the industrial and political movement through his deep research and analysis of capitalist activities. Yet men who have newly entered the Labour Movement from the camp of discredited Liberalism, seek to close the door of the Labour Party in his face, as one who is unfit to associate with them.

Why? For the same reason that the Communist Party is refused affiliation. Because Newbold and the C.P. believe in extra-Parliamentary action.

Comrades, workers, don't let there be any mistake about this.

Apart from William Graham of Edinburgh and Frank Rose of Aberdeen, there is not a Labour Member from Scotland but is a thorough believer in extra-Parliamentary action. Yet it is for believing in extra-Parliamentary action that the Communists are excluded from the Labour Party.

The Conference at Edinburgh was deceived; deliberately misled into believing

that the C.P. had refused to accept the Labour Party constitution.

(We had agreed to accept it. In our correspondence with the Labour Party Executive Committee we made that clear. So much so that they agreed to a sub-committee of the E.C. meeting a sub-committee of the Communist Party E.C. Had we not been prepared to accept the constitution they never would have met us.)

On the 29th December, 1921, the meeting took place. Messrs. Webb, Henderson, Jowett, Davies, Lansbury and Wake represented the Labour Party; MacManus, Inkpin, Gallacher, Bell, Hodgson and Peet, represented the C.P.

The discussion lasted for an hour or more, and it all circled around the parts of our constitution that refer to other than Parliamentary action. They wanted us to delete these before they could consider accepting us.

Webb and Henderson said the Labour Party stood for Parliamentary Action, and Parliamentary Action alone.

When we pointed out that the Labour Party was associated with the Council of Action, Webb made it quite clear that he was utterly opposed to the Council of Action and all its works.

We refused to accept Webb's frigid legalism as a guide to the workers in their life and death struggle against Capitalism, and for this have been barred out from the Councils of the Labour Party. For this offence Newbold has been refused the Labour Party whip.

Comrades, workers of Britain, we appeal to you. We appeal especially to the Red Workers of Scotland.

You have sent your representatives to the House of Commons to fight; don't let them drift into the stupefying torpor of Parliamentary procedure and make-believe. If you do, assuredly they won't want Newbold: They will have no need of him. Make them fight and keep them fighting, and they'll only be too glad to have him in their midst. Keep them fighting and they'll want not only Newbold, but the whole might of the C.P. thrown in along with them.

Comrades, workers, the sleep of death is ever hovering above you. Don't let it descend on you while your eyes are blinded by the glamour of Parliament.

Only through struggle can you rise triumphant over your oppressors.

Only by unity along the whole front can that struggle be effectively waged.

It is to effect that unity we have worked in the past; it is to effect that unity we are working now. For that purpose we will continue working, whatever obstacles our enemies, without and within the Labour movement, may throw in our way.

**ALL POWER to the WORKERS!**

## Correspondence

### "President" Cosgrave

To the Editor of the COMMUNIST.

Dear Comrade,—I notice with astonishment in your last issue, a telegram sent to "President" Cosgrave by the C.P.G.B., protesting against the murder of Republican prisoners of war. Who is this "president"?

I can only conclude that the C.P.G.B. refers to the head of the Provisional Government to which President de Valera refers in his decree of Nov. 18th as follows: "The persons known as or styling themselves the Provisional Government of Southern Ireland and their adherents are an illegal body and every such person is guilty of rebellion against the Republic."

At the Battersea Conference and aforetime, the C.P.G.B. has pledged itself to recognition and support of the Irish Republic and its President, Mr. De Valera. How can it also recognise the usurping junta?

Yours fraternally,

A. B. F. WHITE.

[The designation "President" was imposed upon us by the conditions of the British Post Office.—Ed.]

### Vendetta against Aliens

To the Editor of the COMMUNIST.

Dear Comrade,—

I would be very grateful if you could give publicity to the very "democratic" behaviour of the British Government when deporting undesirable aliens, especially those suspected of having Communist tendencies.

Last April, one of our comrades, Charles Daigird, was arrested on a charge of not registering as an alien and was sentenced to four months imprisonment and recommended to deportation. The sentence was carried out and he was deported on the 6th of September.

Before deporting him, however, the authorities took all his money (which amounted to about £7) from him. They

also collected all monies due to him from comrades who owed him money. Thus they collected something like £11. Before embarking they returned him 15/-. With this magnificent sum they landed him at Hamburg and it has to last him till he reaches Petrograd.

As the above is clearly a case of official vendetta against aliens daring to be Communists (the Sheriff in passing sentence on Comrade Daigird said, if he had his own way, he would pass a sentence, not of four months hard labour, but ten years), and affects a good number of people, it is time to set some move afoot to get at least fair treatment for arrested aliens.

Yours fraternally,

JOSEPH MERKEVITCH.

## DEMONSTRATIONS

to Protest Against Judicial Murder of South African Trade Unionists

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 10th, at 2 p.m., at United Ladies' Tailors' Hall, Great Garden Street, Whitechapel Road

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12th, at 8 p.m., at Canning Town Public Hall  
SAKLATVALA and other Speakers. Further particulars in Daily Press

H. POLLITT, W. T. COLYER, Joint Secs. Labour Defence Committee

## SABOTAGE

**B**ELOW we give a copy of a leaflet which the Communist Party intended to distribute. Arrangements were made with the Victoria House Printing Company (a subsidiary concern of the *Daily Herald*) for fifty thousand of these to be delivered in the morning of Monday, December 4th.

Arrangements were made for the unemployed marchers to call for them at 9 a.m. They arrived in time, accompanied by Wm. Gallacher—only to be informed that the leaflets would not be ready until four in the afternoon.

While they stood arguing for an earlier delivery the manager came along and said that he had been ordered over the telephone by one of his directors, to stop printing the leaflet.

He refused to give the name of the director. As these are all drawn from the Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress, the inference is obvious.

Workers! find out who that director was.

## Unemployed be on your Guard

The Government is trying to trick you. It talks big and makes fine promises about "Relief Schemes" to find you work. It tries to deceive you with proposals and fancy schemes of railway construction. It hopes that the Marchers will return to their homes thinking they have won a victory. Remember, last year the now discredited Coalition Government—of which Bonar Law was an active member—made similar promises about road-making and building construction. But still

## There is no work for you

Representative capitalist spokesmen like Amery and Macnamara say there is no prospect of unemployment decreasing. The idiotic policy of Reparations and Indemnities; the menace of the French occupation of the Ruhr coalfields; the long drawn-out negotiations at Lausanne, and the refusal to recognise Soviet Russia—all go to make trade revival impossible. In short, Capitalism has failed you. Are you to be merely pawns in this Imperialist game of exploitation?

## Why should you suffer?

Your wives and children cry for bread. Those who form this Government are not hungry. Will their fine polished promises fill your bellies? You would be craven cowards, indeed, if you did not make a stand NOW that you are assembled in your thousands.

## BE MEN!

Accept the challenge of the well-fed and comfortable class which Bonar Law represents.

Hold tight! Reinforcements are coming to your aid. Even now your brothers are marching from all parts of the country to swell your numbers.

**BONAR LAW MUST RESPECT YOUR CLAIM** to be treated as human beings. He will, if you stand firm. Be not deceived by the great lying Press about Communism or the Communist Party.

The Communist Party is ever with you in your struggle for bread and work. It will not fail you now.

Remember, millions of your fellows are looking to you anxiously and hopefully; your fight is the fight of those in work.

**You must see the Prime Minister**

**Demand that the Labour M.P.'s help you**

**Demand that the General Council helps you**

**Keep shoulder to shoulder: Victory is yours**

## The Communist

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

"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 FAT MAN'S PRAYER



"And Lord give me strength to keep on top for ever . . . and ever, Amen"

## Towards Improved Organisation

Considerable headway has now been made in the direction of re-organising the Communist Party on the line of the Theses of the Communist International and the Report of the Party Commission adopted by the recent Battersea Conference.

District Party Congresses for the establishment of District Party Committees have been held in London, South Wales and Manchester. As a result of these Congresses strong District Party Committees have been elected, and these Committees are getting down to the task of carrying the re-organisation into the localities and into every phase of Party activity within the respective districts. The Congresses in each case were well attended, and the businesslike way in which the proceedings were conducted, with the intimate understanding of the new proposals displayed by the representatives present, augurs well for the future of the Party.

Further District Party Congresses are to be held in Liverpool and Sheffield on Saturday next, December 9th, for the purpose of setting up the new Party organisation in these districts.

## MEETINGS

### Communist Party Branches

**BIRMINGHAM.** Special Lecture, Floodgate Street School, Sunday, 7 p.m. Prominent Speakers. Bull Ring, Sunday, 11.30 a.m. and 7 p.m. Intending members apply T. Lowe, 27, Heath Mill Lane, Deritend.

**CENTRAL JOINT COUNCIL.** Minerva Cafe, Monday, December 11th, 8 p.m., Comrade Dickinson on "The Communist Manifesto." All welcome.

**CENTRAL LONDON.** Minerva Cafe, New Oxford Street, Sunday, December 10th, at 8 o'clock. Speaker: Comrade Bishop. All welcome.

**ISLINGTON.** T. A. Jackson speaks at West Islington Library, Lofting Road, Caledonian Road, on Sunday, December 10th, at 7.45, on "The Outlook for Labour."

**WOOLWICH.** Sunday, December 10th, at 7.30, Reading Room, Co-op. Buildings, Lakedale Road, Plumstead. Subject: "Poplarism." Lecturer: A. A. Watts. Musical programme.

## "PEACE AND BREAD"

(Continued from Page 5)

relations with England regardless of the fact that the English Government is in a hostile mood with regard to us.

## "Equal Rights"

The Government of Russian peasants and workers demands not privileges but equal rights. The policy of prestige is a policy of struggle for shadows, for phantoms, for fetishes, but the demand that the Great Powers should consider the interests of Russian export and of peace on the Black Sea, that is not a struggle for fetishes, not a struggle for phantoms, but a struggle for the export of bread, for freedom to import agricultural machines, a struggle for assurance against the danger of war on the Black Sea.

And the Government which should make concessions, enormous economic concessions, to persons who do not consider such interests of its people, that Government would lose the right to ask from the popular masses of its country that they should consider it a Government defending their interests.

There you have the reason why we rejected the treaty with Urquhart. Let these reasons be removed and we shall be the first to rejoice when we can conclude business deals with the English business world.

## All Depends on Britain

We do not play games in orientation, and our ship follows a single course—the course of a struggle for peace and bread. And on this course we shall meet ships bringing us goods and ships bringing weapons intended for our destruction.

We shall open our harbours to the first and struggle with the second. It depends on England what she will bring to Russia—goods from Manchester and Sheffield or armaments from the Clyde.

This decision of England will decide our decisions in advance.

There is not in Russia a single lunatic who, attracted by the play of diplomatic shadows on the screen of history, would forget the strength of England, would forget what might be given us by the greatest industrial country in Europe. If in Russia there is to be hostility to England, then be assured that it will be the result of a policy of the English Government hostile to the interests of Russia.

## NOW READY

## "THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL"

(British Edition)

The Magazine of International Communism

## SPECIAL CONGRESS NUMBER

Articles by N. Lenin, G. Zinovieff, Karl Radek, E. Varga, Th. Rothstein, Ch. Rappaport, J. T. Walton Newbold, R. Connolly, D. Ivon Jones, &c.

80 PAGES

ONE SHILLING

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP, 16, King St., Covent Garden, London, W.C.2