

The Trade Union
Congress-J.T. Murphy

THE
COMMUNIST
REVIEW

LABADIE
COLLECTION

HX

3

C758

v.5

pt.1

no.5

Monthly Organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain

Volume V

SEPTEMBER 1924

Number 5

IMPORTANT FEATURES of THIS ISSUE

Must the Empire be Broken Up?
(The Reply to Labour
Imperialism)

By J. R. CAMPBELL

Lenin . . . On Insurrection

Published by the Communist Party of Great Britain
16 King Street, Covent Garden, London, W. C. 2

P R I C E S I X P E N C E



THE STRIKERS' PAPER

THE WORKERS' WEEKLY is proud to be called "the strikers' paper." It shows that our aim is being achieved. We have tried to build up a paper of the working class, written and distributed by the workers themselves, which should be the foundation of the real Workers' Daily which is yet to be. We have succeeded, and we are going on from strength to strength. Boycotted by newsagents, crippled by lack of money, hated and attacked by every defender of capitalism in the Labour movement and feared by the avowed enemies of Labour the paper lives and grows.

¶ Fearless in defence of the workers in every industrial dispute, we have been thanked by railwaymen, tram-men and dockers for the part we played in their struggles.

¶ Just as we have earned, and get, the hatred of the workers' enemies so we have earned and expect the support of every active worker in the Labour movement.

¶ Are you doing *your share*? Are you buying the paper? If so, are you helping to sell it to other workers?

Write for particulars of agency
to Business Manager at
address hereunder



THE WORKERS' WEEKLY

(INCORPORATING "THE COMMUNIST")

Official Organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain
16 KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.1

Telephone Gerrard 877

COMMUNIST PARTY of GREAT BRITAIN

PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT

**A Short Course of Economic
Science by A. Bogdanoff**

Translated by J. Fineberg.

Paper 3s. 3d. Cloth 5s. 4d. Post free

A B C of Communism

by **BUHARIN and PREOBRAJHENSKY**

Translated from the Russian by Eden and
Cedar Paul. Second Complete Edition.

Paper 3s. 3d. Cloth 5s. 4d. Post free

The International Outlook

by **KARL RADEK**

24 pages 2d. Post free 2½d.

1s. 11d. per dozen post free

**The Communist Party and
the Labour Government**

12 pages 1d. Post free 1½d.

10½d. per dozen post free

Order from *The Communist Bookshop*
16 KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W. C. 2

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

A Monthly Organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain

Editorial and Publishing Offices : 16 King Street, Covent Garden, W. C. 2

EDITOR : THOS. BELL

BUSINESS MANAGER : A. H. HAWKINS

Volume 5

SEPTEMBER 1924

Number 5

C O N T E N T S

Editorial View	- - - - -	211
Must the Empire be Broken Up? (The Reply to Labour Imperialism) <i>J. R. Campbell</i>	- - - - -	216
The United Front <i>T. Bell</i>	- - - - -	225
The Trade Union Congress <i>J. T. Murphy</i>	- - - - -	230
The Sudan Scandal <i>T. A. Jackson</i>	- - - - -	236
Lenin . . . On Insurrection	- - - - -	241
International News	- - - - -	251
The Forum	- - - - -	253

Notice to Contributors, &c. M.S.S. and letters relating thereto should be addressed to Editor, COMMUNIST REVIEW, 16, King Street, W. C. 2.

Subscription Rates. HOME—Single copies, 6 months, 3s. 9d. postpaid. One year 7s. 0d. postpaid. ABROAD—Single copies 6 months 3s. 9d. One year 7s. 0d. postpaid. Home and Abroad—Bundle orders, 12 copies for 4s. 6d. postpaid, sale or return.

All business communications to Manager, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Editor: THOS. BELL

THE EDITORIAL VIEW

WITH the close of the London Conference, what Mr. MacDonald is pleased to call "the first treaty of peace since the war" has been concluded. It only remains for the German Ministers to go through the parliamentary farce of approval and the deed is done. A treaty of peace! We prefer to call it "the first open pact of the Second International with the bourgeoisie against the international proletariat." For what does this alleged plan to bring peace to Europe mean?

As with the Versailles Treaty, the demand for Reparations and Indemnities is reaffirmed. The difference in this case is, that the Experts' Plan is a more scandalous imposition upon the working class in Germany than even Versailles. After Versailles, the Allies had not only the German workers to defeat, they had to reconcile the German bourgeoisie as well. The experience of the last four years cemented the pact needed for the effective exploitation of the German masses by the Allied and German bourgeoisie combined. Germany is now a slave colony for international finance, particularly of Wall Street and London.

According to this precious scheme for the restoration of Germany and European peace, the big international financiers will regulate the payments, determine the budget and control German industry, and generally dictate things in such a way as to secure the maximum of profit for themselves. The instrument for carrying out this nefarious work will, of course, be the German industrialists, aided by the Second Internationalists throughout Europe.

As we pointed out last month in these columns, the German industrialists have declared that if they have to pay reparations then they must have the means at their disposal to raise them. These means which they have quite frankly laid down are the abolition of the eight hours day, the abolition of the workers' councils, and reduced wages.

If on the top of these conditions, to pay the bankers their dole, increased taxation is to be imposed upon tobacco, sugar and other articles included in the necessary expenses of the working class, then it is quite obvious that, far from ushering in a new era of peace, Mr. MacDonald and his "democratic" colleagues have gone about the best way possible to store up fresh trouble. And frankly, we hope they will get it.

We need not go into all the technicalities of this latest piece of brigandage. Reams of paper have been used to explain these. This much we are certain, the carrying out of this programme will have its repercussion for the workers in all the "victorious" countries, and for this, the working class of the Allied countries must be prepared. No pacifist verbiage of MacDonald should be allowed to obscure the real danger that lies ahead. The Experts' Plan will be shattered upon the rivalries and antagonisms of the conflicting groups. Its operation will open a new chapter of industrial struggles for the working class.

The Communist Party will redouble its efforts to show the workers of Great Britain that the extraction of Reparations from Germany means the more thorough exploitation of the German working class, and the temporary strengthening of capitalism throughout Europe, only to lead, finally, to a new war.

* * * * *

Our party has had exceptional opportunities for testing the feelings of the whole Labour movement in this country on the question of a new war. During our recent anti-war campaign, which coincided with the tenth anniversary of the opening of the great slaughter of 1914-18, not a town or village into which our speakers went, or to which our literature was sent, but received our message against war with enthusiasm. It was a fitting climax to our campaign that the Party Headquarters should be broken into, and the Editor of the *Workers' Weekly* arrested. It was the best proof that our propaganda was on the right lines. That such proceedings, however, should be carried out with the authority and cognisance of "our first Labour Government," only sealed the warning our party uttered during its campaign regarding the Imperialist designs of the MacDonald Cabinet.

No doubt "official Labour," i.e., MacDonald, Henderson, Thomas, and the one-time pacifist I.L.P., will try to cover up this open alliance with the war-mongers, and seek to prove to the Labour Party Conference in October, that the Communists were deliberately seeking to embarrass the Government.

We hope the workers will be on their guard against such a

canard. Our only crime is that we have dared to say openly what the leaders of the Second International have approved in resolution form at International conferences. We refuse to distinguish between the workers in uniform and in mufti. The workers who have been lured into the army, the navy or the air force by promises of better pay than in industrial life, or who have been driven to join the colours out of sheer starvation, are still part and parcel of the Labour movement. We hold it is our first task to warn those workers of the dark forces behind the military machine, and to win them over to the side of their class struggling against capitalism and war.

The ignominious retreat forced upon the government by the storm of protests from all over the working class movement is proof to us that the workers are against the imperialist designs of the MacDonald Cabinet. That spirit the Communist Party will never betray. It was for such reasons that we were compelled to repudiate the slander upon our party made by the prosecution when withdrawing the case, in suggesting that we had retracted what was said in our Party paper. Naturally, the capitalist Press tried to make the most of the situation by demanding a statement from Mr. MacDonald. We hope Mr. MacDonald, if he thinks it worth while replying to the *Times* or the other capitalist papers, that his responsibilities are to the Labour movement alone, and not to Carmelite House, or its associates.

Not only was the defence of the Communist Party "justification," but we propose to go further and to appeal for more recruits to our party, so that we may be able to intensify and extend our work against war and imperialism. The number of workers that came forward during our anti-war week and joined our ranks is proof that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of active workers in the Labour movement who have been disillusioned by the parliamentary antics of the Labour Cabinet, and are seriously looking for a fighting lead. Our recruiting week, September 14th to the 21st, to the slogan of "**Double our membership: Increase the circulation of the *Workers' Weekly***" is our reply to the prosecution.

* * * * *

Amongst the more important questions down for discussion at the forthcoming Labour Party conference, is the question of the responsibility of the Labour Government. To whom should the Government be responsible? To the "nation," the "people," "King George the Fifth," or to the Labour Party? Readers of the *Communist Review* will remember our editorial as far back

as our February issue of this year, where we drew attention to this question, and warned the workers to be vigilant and critical of the spurious doctrine MacDonald was then preaching about the "non-party" mind.

When the *liaison* committee was set up we characterised it as a complete surrender of power and control by the party and the trade unions into the hands of Labour's inveterate enemies. We are glad this question is to be raised. To think that MacDonald, Henderson, Clynes, Thomas—not to speak of the young Liberals and Tories that have floated into the party for the obvious purpose of corrupting it—should be able to arrogate to themselves the right to determine policy without any effective check or control from the party is monstrous. Clearly the way of the "Non-party" mind leads to demoralisation in the ranks. To refuse to make the Labour Government responsible to the Party Congress for its conduct is to give MacDonald and his colleagues a blank cheque to commit us to any diabolical scheme the imperialists and financiers choose to engineer.

It is not enough to say Mr. MacDonald would never degrade parliament as to yield to any clique of vested interests.

We need only recall the Singapore affair, the bombing at Iraq, and the military operations against the Sudanese to see that the *real* political power of the government is in the hands of financial groups outside parliament, *i.e.*, in the hands of the capitalists. Those who read the criticisms in this issue of the *Review* of Tom Johnston and John Scurr, and realise how far these two former anti-war stalwarts have capitulated to the non-party mind, *i.e.*, the non-class bias, will appreciate how dangerous is the bourgeois notion that Cabinet Ministers should not be responsible to Party or class. The other questions about the humiliating spectacle of the workers' representatives wearing Court dress and dangling swords, and presenting their wives and daughters as objects for the entertainment and amusement of the parasites who frequent Court levees, are all part of the same mentality. Nothing is to be gained for the workers by the policy of class collaboration but defeat. We hope the Congress will say so in no uncertain voice.

* * * * *

Once more, the question of the application of the Communist Party for affiliation will be raised. The experience at the last general election and the growing support for our party all over the country makes it impossible for the bureaucrats at Eccleston Square to ignore the question. We do not profess to know what

the Executive is going to recommend to the conference, but judging from the conversations that took place when the two sub-committees of the C.P. and the Labour Party executives met on July 29th, we may anticipate one or two queries likely to be raised and meet them here.

Our attitude remains the same as it was when we submitted our answers to the questionnaire put to us prior to the Edinburgh Conference. We demand affiliation to the Labour Party, being a bona-fide working class party, on the same terms as other affiliated bodies, viz., the rights of party independence and criticism, with a view to determining the policy and programme of the Labour Party, which is a common association of working class unions and political organisations.

It has been alleged that it would be inconsistent for a Communist Party to be affiliated to the Second International (as we would be by virtue of association with the Labour Party) and the Third International. Such an inconsistency would certainly obtain if we could imagine, for example, the Communist Party of Germany or France affiliating to the Second International. But the Labour Party, is a common association of working class organisations, many of which do not accept the policy of the Second International leaders. The question of "allegiance" which is the same thing in other words, is not a question for Communists alone to answer. To whom, we might ask, does the Second International Prime Ministers and Cabinet Ministers owe their allegiance? That query may be put with as much seriousness to Mr. MacDonald, Branting, and Vandervelde, as to the Communists.

Whatever, be the decision in October, the Communist Party will continue its work of agitation and propaganda amongst the masses as before. More than that, since we are a bona-fide working class party, we will continue to be active with the working class in all their struggles against the imperialists and financiers. For only through struggle can the working class win through to final victory.

The immediate future is pregnant with fierce battles and combats for the workers. Soon the democratic veil of Wilsonism will be cast aside from the open and brutal front of capitalist terror. It is up to those who are wavering amidst the uncertainties and pacifist crudities of the moment to gather round the standard of Communism and the Communist Party. For the future is with us.

Must the Empire be Broken Up? The Reply to Labour Imperialism

THE British Labour Government on taking office has assumed control not only over the destiny of the British people, but over that of the hundreds of millions of people inhabiting the British Empire. This raises the whole question of Empire in the sharpest possible fashion, and no section of the Labour movement can avoid giving its answer to it.

The answer of the Right-wing contained in the speeches of Mr. J. H. Thomas is simply a reiteration of all the stale apologies for capitalist Imperialism that have been current for the last generation. Mr. Thomas, however, is no more a Socialist than Lord Curzon, and his crude and glaring eulogies of Imperialism have only awakened disgust in the Labour Movement.

The moderate Socialist wing of the Labour Party, the I.L.P., has also been discussing the question of Empire. It does not go over to Imperialism so brazenly as Mr. J. H. Thomas, but by means of a considerable expenditure of Socialist phraseology, it arrives at the same position.

WHAT IS THE EMPIRE?

The typical representatives of the I.L.P. position on Empire are Messrs. John Scurr, M.P. and Tom Johnston, M.P. An analysis of the articles they have been writing recently will show that, in spite of their anti-Imperialist phraseology, their attitude to the Empire is a thoroughly capitalist one. Mr. Scurr states his point of view in an article on Labour and Empire in the *Socialist Review*, for August (an official organ of the I.L.P.).

The article is designed to lay bare the capitalist basis of Empire and to suggest a policy for Labour.

We are met right at the outset with such phrases as—

“If Labour is to control the destinies of this country, it will have to face the fact of the British Empire. A mere gesture of negation is impossible.”

“In so far as Labour will be able to deal with the problem of Empire, will depend the future of the world’s peace.”

The following quotation gives what Mr. Scurr conceives to be the basis of capitalist Imperialism :—

"About 1870 a number of important developments took place in the iron and steel industry. Mass production became the rule, and combines ensued in the metallurgical industry, with the consequence that capital invested in metals, became more important than that invested in textiles. The economic, and, therefore, the political, balance of power shifted from Manchester to Birmingham. Joseph Chamberlain succeeded John Bright. Now the products of iron and steel are mostly capital goods, such as machinery, steel rails, etc., and they require considerable finance. Money capital is exported to undeveloped countries and a change in exports takes place. Instead of goods, such as textiles, which are consumed quickly, constructional goods, railway bridges, etc., are exported. But the textile exporter only wanted people to buy his wares. How they were governed, provided they paid his bills, did not matter. Free Trade and plenty of it was his ideal. When, however, your money is invested in railways and the like in the new countries, it is important that you control the government in order to safeguard your investments. You want a monopoly and Free Trade seems to be a foolish idea."

To our mind this is a one-sided, inaccurate view of the basis of modern Imperialism. It is true that the great Imperialist impulse commenced after 1870. It is also true that the metal industry played a considerable part in this development, but it is positively inaccurate to assert that modern Imperialism is the product of the growing importance of the metal industry alone. Imperialism is capitalism in its final stage of development. Its special feature, from the point of view of the internal situation of the various capitalist countries, is not merely the growing preponderance of the metal industry, but the growth of monopoly capitalism.

Now, a feature of monopoly capitalism is the increasing power exercised by the banks and the big financial houses in the control of the industrial system. This monopoly capitalism is the inevitable result of previous capitalist development. In all countries it seeks to secure exclusive sources of raw materials and exclusive outlets for its products, and just as in the previous epoch of free competition, the individual capitalists competed against one another for the market, their weapon being cheapness, so to-day, the great national syndicates compete against one another by endeavouring to secure a monopoly of the sources of supply. From this struggle results the world scramble for sources of raw materials and outlets for investment.

It must be emphasised that Imperialism is not a particular line of development which capitalist industry has followed in preference to some other line that it might equally well have followed. It is the absolutely inevitable culmination of the previous capitalist development. Empire is simply the outward and visible result of the Imperialist struggle. Apart from serving modern capitalist needs, empires have no reason for their existence. It is impossible to separate Empire and Imperialist

capitalist policy, just as impossible as to separate capitalism and wage slavery.

Two results of Imperialist policy may here be noted. In the first place through its irruption into colonial countries, it creates a native bourgeoisie, and it also breaks down certain barriers which have separated the native people, creating in them a national consciousness which leads to movements aiming at independence.

Secondly, through its unrestrained exploitation of the peoples of colonial countries, the capitalists in the Metropolis are able to more easily concede better terms to a few favoured strata of workers at home, filling them with a sense of Imperialist dignity, and a belief in the inevitability and the advisability of peaceful progress. *The Imperialist corruption of the Labour movement is one of the most important facts to-day, a fact that the modern working class cannot afford to ignore.*

DOES BRITISH EMPIRE MAKE FOR PEACE?

Bearing in mind the fact that modern Empires are the result of the domination of Imperialist states, representing monopoly capitalism over territories in which the capitalists can find spheres of investment and secure supplies of raw materials; that they are as necessary features of modern capitalism as employers and employed, trusts and syndicates, mansions and slums, let us turn to Mr. Tom Johnston's plea for a new attitude to be adopted by Socialists to the Empire, which was published in *Forward*, of July 26th. Mr. Johnston tells us

"it is about time we were clarifying our minds on the British Empire in its relation to Socialist philosophy.

"In some Socialist circles—but these are smaller and fewer than they were a dozen years ago—there is a fixed belief that this Empire is an engine of grab and oppression and that it is and can be nothing more."

If Mr. Johnston is affirming here, that there are more "Socialists" in favour of the British Empire than there were a decade ago, we are perfectly willing to accept his statement. He might have added that there are more "Socialists" in favour of kow-towing to the British monarchy than ever before, and that the capitalist doctrine of "increased production" is now receiving a wholehearted benediction in certain "Socialist" quarters.

All this may be admitted, but it promptly raises the question of whether those developments are of a healthy character, or, whether they are symptoms of the Imperialist corruption of the Labour movement!

He goes on—

"Would the peace of the world be made more secure if this League of British Nations were to fly apart? The question has indeed only to be

put to be answered. Fifty new States, most of them prey for other avaricious Empires, most of them ready for the creation of separate armaments—nay, some of them driven to it. To take one example only, would the scrapping of the British Empire make for peace in the Pacific, or would there be a bloody struggle between Japan and Australia within twelve months' time?"

There is a multitude of mis-statements and fallacies embodied in this short paragraph.

Take the description of the Empire as a British League of Nations. Seven-eighths of the peoples in this British Empire are members of alien races, most of them coloured people, who are held down and exploited on behalf of British capitalism. The adherence of those people to the Empire is secured by the most cruel and vicious military oppression. They are not British, they have no national rights, they are merely a dumb, driven labour force kept in control for the purpose of the most murderous exploitation. To describe such a bloody despotism as a British League of Nations is surely a brazen attempt to hide the essential nature of the Empire.

We know that it is an old trick of the capitalist Imperialists to hide the real nature of the Empire by turning working class attention to the self-governing dominions (Canada, Australia, etc.), leaving the exploited masses of black, brown and yellow men out of the picture. It is with mixed feelings of pain and disgust that we see the same shabby political trick being played in the Labour movement.

Another idea embodied in the above sentence is that Empire is a guarantee of peace. This is revising Socialist doctrine with a vengeance. If true, it certainly involves the duty of all those who desire peace to extend the bounds of our "peaceful" Empire over yet wider tracts of the earth.

There are two great periods of expansion in the history of the Empire. The first was during the period of commercial capitalism in the eighteenth century, when Britain conquered Canada, began to open up Australia, consolidated British power in the West Indies, beat the French in India, and commenced the subjugation of that country. This period was an intensely bloody and warlike one, not only in our struggles with France, but in our efforts to subjugate the native races. It is only necessary to mention the good "pacifists" Clive and Warren Hastings, and pass on.

During this period some of the territory occupied was suitable for the purposes of settlement by the people of British birth (Canada, Australia, etc.).

Following upon this period came the development of indus-

trial capitalism, and a concentration upon the building up of the productive forces within Great Britain, and the securing of markets abroad. The great industrial expansion which took place was aided by the wealth wrung from looting and trading in the colonies in the preceding period. In the early period of the building up of the Factory system, there was a slackening off, but not an abandonment of the expansionist policy.

THE CULMINATION OF IMPERIALIST POLICIES.

From 1870 we enter upon the period when free competition begins to give way to monopoly capitalism, when the need for securing spheres of influence, outlets for investments and sources of raw materials begins to be felt. The scramble for Empire becomes a capitalist necessity. This period is one of the most warlike in human history. Hardly a year passed but there were warlike operations in some part of our far-flung Imperial line. Frontier wars in India, the conquest of Egypt, and later, the conquest of the Sudan; punitive expeditions all over Africa, the South African wars, Imperialist tussles over the decomposing corpse of the Turkish Empire.

Imperialist intrigues in China, and our Indian expansion brings us up against Russia, the Egyptian policy leads to a twenty-years' estrangement from France. Our policy in the Near East brings us up against German Imperialism, the penetration of British capital into South America leads almost to a clash with the U.S.A. over Venezuela. These are but a few of the antagonisms generated during this period.

All the main capitalist countries take part in the scramble for Empire and the growth of armaments and militarism receives great impetus. Here are the figures of army and naval expenditure in Britain during the period from 1867 to 1914.

Year		Army	Navy
1867-8	£17,419,000	£11,169,000
1913-14	£28,346,000	£48,883,000

Most of the territory occupied in this period is quite unsuitable for white settlement. It has been occupied purely for the purpose of exploitation.

We could stop here and say that the facts are conclusive, and that this period of Empire development has been one of the most bloody in human history. We must add, however, that the culmination of this period of Imperialist development in Europe was the world war of 1914-18. That is the final answer to those who hold that the British Empire, or any other Empire, is an agency for peace.

THE NATIONAL MOVEMENTS IN THE COLONIES.

During the world war there came to a head the great awakening of the peoples in the Colonies. Powerful Nationalist movements began to struggle for independence. This did not lead to a large scale military struggle, but it did lead to an intensification of brutal military repression all over the Empire. The war against the Colonial peoples has become continuous. So far from the Empire being an agency of peace it can only be kept in existence by the most ferocious wars upon the struggling peoples under Imperialist control.

Here arises a situation which the Labour movement must face. India is in revolt, Egypt is in revolt, the Sudan is in revolt, and Irak is in revolt. What is to be the attitude of the Labour movement in face of these facts?

Mr. Johnston states—

“There are men in the Socialist and Labour movement who quite sincerely believe that the energies of the organised Labour Party ought to be devoted towards smashing up the Empire, and that the world would be happier were there snapped the loose tegument which binds together some 443 million people who inhabit a fourth of the surface of the earth. For the life of me, I cannot see it. I cannot see how the cause of Socialism would be advanced in the slightest degree were the Empire to split asunder to-night.”

The description of the brutal coercive apparatus of British Imperialism, as a loose tegument deserves the widest publicity. Could not Mr. Leach see that it is transmitted to the herdmen of Irak, via the knights of the bomb, the R.A.F.?

What one gathers from the above paragraph is that the Empire is a loose federation of peoples living amicably together and some crack-brained antiquated Socialists filled with a spirit of destruction are trying to break it up. It is a false picture. The true picture is that the colonial peoples are tugging at their chains. Are we, as Socialists, going to help them to break them, or are we going to rivet them tighter about their limbs? Are we going to be parties to murder and outrage on behalf of Imperialism?

It is not the Socialist cranks who are trying to break up the Empire, but the peoples whom the Empire holds in thralldom. What are we going to do?

WHY WE MUST SUPPORT THE COLOURED PEOPLES.

The Communist declares that Imperialism being the final stage of capitalism, the colonial peoples in revolt and the workers in Great Britain are fighting the same enemy. They can derive increased strength by allying themselves in the struggle. If the maximum force has to be brought against British

Imperialism, then the British workers and the struggling peoples in the colonies must act together. At the same time, the Communists recognise the different strata in the various national movements, and desire to establish such close relations with the lowest stratum of those movements—the workers and peasants as will enable them to carry their struggle beyond the national revolution against British Imperialism on to a workers' and peasants' revolution against all forms of domination.

If the workers in Britain take sides with the Imperialists against the nationalist movement of the colonies and assist in its suppression for the time being, then the Imperialists will most certainly use the power that they derive from the colonies against a workers' government in this country. All those in revolt against British Imperialism must form a united front, or perish.

I.L.P. AND COLONIAL STRUGGLE.

What is the position of our two I.L.P. friends towards the national struggle in the colonies? To Mr. Scurr, the national struggle is non-existent. In his article the Empire is treated as a unit which is likely to exist indefinitely, and a series of proposals are made, which are calculated, in the opinion of the author, to knit the Empire closer together, and improve the material and cultural level of all its inhabitants.

The fact that you can no more have a Socialist Empire than Socialist capitalism is completely ignored.

THE MEANING OF HOME RULE.

Mr. Johnston in the *Forward* for August 9th, criticising Walton Newbold, faces the problem in this fashion:—

"But he boggles at India and the Crown Colonies and the Protectorates and the mandated territories staying in the Union? Why should there be any difficulty if they have Home Rule and come in of their own free will? Our business surely ought to be to convert the subject colonies into free partners."

Now, obviously, if Mr. Johnston is in favour of giving the people in the various parts of the colonies the right to choose independence, instead of Home Rule, and if he is in favour of supporting them in this demand, then he is in favour of the break up of the Empire. For it is from that quarter and not from some small Socialist groups that the urge towards the break up of the Empire is coming.

If, however, he is not going beyond Home Rule within the Empire, and is prepared to support the repression of any attempt to go beyond Home Rule, then he is merely lining up with the Imperialists in the new orientation of their policy.

We have already pointed out that there has developed in some of the colonies a native bourgeoisie. This bourgeoisie desires to develop freely without any interference on the part of the British Imperialists. It was very active in the national movements at the outset, but as those movements develop in their full amplitude, the upper strata of the native bourgeoisie, feeling themselves too weak to prevent the movement going beyond the national demands to social demands, begins to shrink somewhat from the struggle.

A section of them show a determination to compromise for the time being with the Imperialists by accepting some form of Dominion Home Rule, or even, as in the case of Egypt, a shadowy independence. The Imperialists are prepared to accept this compromise, provided that the native bourgeoisie is prepared to safeguard the rights of the British Imperialists within the territory, and to hold down the rest of the population. The granting of Home Rule in some form or other is a pure matter of Imperialist convenience. There is nothing Socialist about it.

THE "DOMINIONS."

As for the parts of the Empire like Australia and Canada, which are inhabited largely by English-speaking peoples, it must plainly be recognised that those countries are virtually independent capitalist states, beginning to develop their own manufacturing industries, in fact, beginning to compete with the Mother Country in the markets of the world. If they remain associated with Britain it is because their financial and political interests so dictate, that is all.

When Mr. Johnston talks about the advantages of the State in Britain purchasing Australian goods in bulk, suppressing the middleman and selling them cheaply in Great Britain, he forgets that a similar arrangement might be made with Denmark. It has nothing to do with Empire, and to use it as an excuse for Imperialist suppression is absurd.

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT.

The one thing that is necessary is to view the colonial situation in its proper perspective. If one views the colonial struggle as being isolated from the struggle of the workers at home, then one sees things all wrong. They are both phases of the one struggle against capitalist Imperialism, and for the establishment of Socialism.

If the British workers allow themselves to be used against the peoples of the colonies, then the anti-Imperialist front is

broken, and the Imperialists are strengthened. But, if the British workers line up with the colonial peoples in the struggle, then that unity contains within itself the guarantee of victory. It is the duty of the workers in other Imperialist states to carry out a similar tactic. Only by such means can the struggle for emancipation be successful in European countries.

The emancipated European workers will be able to help the exploited classes in the colonies to largely evade the phase of capitalist development by passing from their present stage to Socialism.

The break up of the Empire is not then the fantasy of a few Socialist cranks, but is an essential part of the struggle for Socialism. Whoever refuses the colonial peoples the fullest independence is an ally of the Imperialists, and is as big a danger to working class progress as the union leader who goes over to the employers during an industrial dispute.

The Communist Party is the only anti-Imperialist party in Britain to-day. That is to say, it is the only party which is genuinely struggling against capitalism.

J. R. CAMPBELL.



The United Front

SOME QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

A NUMBER of letters have reached this office lately, principally from Communist Party members, raising the question of the United Front, with special reference to our attitude towards the Labour Party, and our criticism of a number of the Labour leaders. As it is impossible to print all of these we have selected a number of questions put, as typical of certain doubts abroad in the hope that we will be able to anticipate the difficulties which evidently exist in some comrades' minds, and help to make clear where our Party stands.

It is acknowledged that since the Labour Party took over the reins of government, our criticism of the leadership of the Party has been considerably sharpened. We take the view that to have allowed the policy of the MacDonald Cabinet on India, on armaments, on industrial disputes, on unemployment, on the Experts' Plan, etc., to go unchallenged, would have been treason to the working class movement, and to have placed the Communist Party on the same plane as the I.L.P. and the other reformist parliamentary outfits who worship at the shrine of St. Stephens. All that is acknowledged by the youngest member in our Party. What does appear to some of our members as a paradox and a contradiction is that while we are exposing the treacherous conduct of the MacDonald Cabinet we continue to demand entrance into the Labour Party, and even seek to get Communist Party members nominated as parliamentary Labour candidates. This question has been raised in a letter we have received from a Party member, who puts the query thus:—

"How can a Communist unite with such treacherous representatives of the working class. Criticising them makes the rank and file begin to oppose the C.P. They say 'why don't you admit you are against us.' Does this not stultify our propaganda for Communism?"

WHY WE CRITICISE.

It has always been one of the strongest arguments in favour of seeking affiliation to the Labour Party, that there was a distinction between the general membership of the Party (which is a common association of working class organisations, and not a centralised party) and its leadership. Whereas the membership is largely proletarian, the leadership is in the hands of Fabians, ex-Liberals, and one-time trade union leaders or Socialist poli-

ticians—all of whom are completely dominated by the mentality of the capitalists. Thus we find MacDonal repudiating party control, and even the very name of Socialism, notwithstanding that Socialism is the declared objective of the Party. Moreover, that is why we get all the Court flunkeyism, jingoism and empiritis, so characteristic of the bourgeoisie.

It would be very convenient for these leaders if they were allowed to pursue the even tenour of their ways without any challenge. If there was complete acquiescence in their conduct they might go down in history as great statesmen instead of the traitors to their class which they are. But the Communist Party refuses to become a sect. We know that a revolution is impossible without a majority of the working class. The confidence of that majority can only be won out of the common struggle. Sectarianism never did build up a real party of the masses. And so the Communist Party identifies itself in the daily struggles of the working masses in all their fights against their exploiters. As part of the working class we urge the workers to be critical of the leaders, lest they be defeated in their fight against the capitalists. We should betray the best interests of the workers if we kept silent when the Party leaders were being used as the cat's-paws of our historic enemies.

WORKERS AND LEADERS: A DIFFERENCE.

It is quite true that many workers don't like to hear criticism of their favourite leaders. And to pander to the whims or the prejudices of the backward sections of the working class would be an easy task. But what would they think of us when their eyes were opened to the realities of the struggle before them? Would they not throw us aside with the other traitors they had discovered, Of course they would, and we would deserve it.

The class struggle is a hard school. Sentiment certainly has its place, but it must never be allowed to deflect our Party from its revolutionary course. So soon as it does that we are on the straight road to reformist opportunism.

When, therefore, the workers say "why don't you admit you are against us" that is our opportunity for showing them their mistaken ideas about our Party, and to show up the difference between the class interests of the workers and the middle class leadership of the Labour Party. Many workers who are against us at present will then see the real reasons for our criticism, and understand.

We know it is difficult in the local labour parties especially to associate with many people whose records are rotten, to put it

mildly. But the United Front has never meant that we were to pretend to the workers we were a happy family, full of love and undying friendship for one another. Only the merest political infants, or place-hunters would suggest that. The class struggle is a serious matter. The working class has prejudices. It may be for their party, their trade union or their leaders. If, despite experience they continue to trust leaders whom we know are rotters it would be foolishness to fly in the face of facts and spend our time trying to explain how wicked their "heroes" are.

Much prejudice exists against our Party by the senseless repetition of crimes committed by the Labour fakirs without any relation to time, place or circumstance. To effectively expose these false leaders, we must put them to the test. That is to say, we must put forward proposals for action upon the burning questions of the day. We must give them an opportunity to fight and prove their sincerity. If they refuse, then the workers will be able to judge them for what they are worth. If they fight all that the better we will then be able to sharpen the class antagonism, and help in preparing the workers for the struggle that lies ahead. The united front does not mean an alliance with the leaders of the reactionary organisations. That can only be incidental in the struggle. A better formula for the United Front is "With the leaders if they will fight, against them if they won't."

SHOULD WE SINK OUR IDENTITY?

Another question is put as follows :

"Is there not a tendency, especially at Election times, to surrender any cause, and to sink our identity by our members subduing our Party programme?"

Undoubtedly that tendency manifested itself at the last election to the chagrin of some of our most enthusiastic party workers. The temptation to win the support of some little tin-pot group of admirers of J. H. Thomas, some religious bigots or reactionaries on the local labour parties is very great. In the heat of the electoral contest the passion to beat the opposition and "get in" sometimes dominates. As a matter of fact, some comrades have argued that our *real* propaganda only begins after we get our man in! This is to confuse the whole position of our Party in its attitude towards parliamentarism. There are no dividing lines between our propaganda outside parliament and inside parliament. Our propaganda never ceases. To sink our Party identity in order to win seats in parliament, or local government institutions would be sheer parliamentary opportunism, and akin to the policy pursued by the parties of the Second International. Were we to

do so, how could the workers ever come to see the correctness of our revolutionary policy; what need would there be for a Communist Party at all?

If we have the confidence of the workers there is no need to sink our programme or our Party identity. If our members make their Party associations known, there is no need to hide things. If it is necessary, however, to conceal our Party, or our programme, obviously we are in a false position. It may be that the workers in a locality, though not Communist would prefer a Communist to be their candidate to that of an I.L.P.'er; in that case it is the duty of a Communist to get the workers to accept as much of the Party programme as they can. In any case it must always be made perfectly clear during the contest what is the Communist Party's attitude on the main questions before the workers. But there can be no question of sinking our Party identity or our programme. It will not be contested that the corrupting influences at work amongst the foremost leaders of the Labour Party and the big trade unions will have a corresponding effect on large sections of the workers to the demoralisation of our ranks. That is the strategy of the capitalists at the moment. All the more necessary that the Communist Party keeps clear its revolutionary programme and policy so that in the process of disillusionment the workers will see a way out, and a party to lead them.

THE LEFT WING.

Out of the misunderstanding as to the real meaning of the United Front another query has arisen:—

"Since many workers don't like the name of Communism, besides, seeing that a number of workers, who are not Communists are opposed to the conduct of the Labour Ministers, is it not in keeping with the united front to form a "left-wing" movement on the political field similar to the minority movement on the industrial field."

When the Labour Party met with its successes in 1923, we welcomed the advent of a "Left" tendency, which particularly manifested itself in the "Clyde Brigade." We saw then the possibilities for such a left movement as would seriously challenge Ramsay MacDonald and his confrères. But MacDonald was always a politician. His selection of Wheatly and Shinwell was more design than accident. This, the Clyde group now know to their cost. All that is left to-day is a disgruntled group which, like Bottom the weaver, "will *roar* that it shall do any man's heart good to hear him."

There is undoubtedly scope for a "left-wing" inside the political Labour movement. But it has to be inside the Labour Party. Just as we cannot countenance new unions on the indus-

trial field—for be it remembered the Minority Movement is not an alternative to the trade unions on the industrial field—neither can we countenance any so-called “left-wing” political group as an alternative to the Communist Party.

There is undoubtedly need to crystallise the “left” elements in the Labour Party and give them a definite political direction. But that is not to be done at the expense of the Communist Party. Those who think that way are mistaking the strength of the Communists.

Our Party encourages the crystallising of a definite working class opposition to the middle class ideology that is now side-tracking the Labour Party, and, therefore, leading the working class to defeat. But the correctness of the policy of such an opposition will be tested by its approximation to the programme of the Communists. With the Communist Party inside the Labour Party, the task of keeping clear the definite class aims of the working class from the corrupting bourgeois influences upon the Labour Party leadership would be easier. Towards that objective our members must continue to fight.

It is a familiar practise for opportunists in the Labour movement to pose as “left-wingers” until they “get there.” Once “there” they continue to lisp the verbiage upon which they made “good.” We have many striking examples amongst the coterie of writers at present contributing to our contemporary *The Labour Monthly*, on the problem of re-organisation, or “Towards a new policy.”

Opposition to the name of Communism or to the Communist Party probed to the quick, invariably reveals the traits of the opportunist. The Communist Party will certainly encourage the crystallisation of a definite class opposition to the bourgeois democratic policy of the middle leadership, which has nobbled the control of the Labour Party. But it will at the same time urge forward and hasten the development of a mass Communist Party towards the dictatorship of the proletariat. For only that way lies the final victory of the working class.

THOS BELL.

The Trade Union Congress

A VARIETY of exceptional circumstances surround the 56th Annual Meeting of the Trade Union Congress. For the first time in the history of the working class movement it meets under the shadow of a Labour Government. For the first time since the Russian Revolution representatives from the Russian Trade Unions will be present, as fraternal delegates. Were these the only exceptions they would mark off this Congress from all preceding Congresses as unique.

But other outstanding events cannot be ignored. Two International Conferences of world significance have just been held. One has produced the Anglo-Russian Treaty, the other has brought agreement into the ranks of international capitalism, for the deeper enslavement of the workers of Europe. We refer to the Dawes' Report.

The agenda, as issued, gives not the slightest indication that these events have any relation whatever to the work of the Congress, and we shall be dependent upon the General Council's Report and the three emergency resolutions which the Council is empowered to introduce, for recognition of the most outstanding features of the Congress.

A CONSERVATIVE INSTITUTION.

If the situation was not so serious the farcical position of the delegates would be a standing joke of the working class movement. Could anything be more ridiculous than the Trades Union Congress, listening seriously to speeches and arguments and bound to vote for one or other of the resolutions already on the agenda, and powerless to move any amendment or alternative resolution from the floor of the Congress? The Congress is not a deliberative body, meeting together on behalf of the union movement as a whole, thrashing out a policy to govern and lead all the unions during the coming year. It is a gathering of the rank and file to approve of the carefully-sifted resolutions of the separate union executives. The Trades Union Congress is, accordingly, one of the most conservative of institutions, and one can guarantee that any resolution passing through its sieve, having the appearance of being advanced is either the result of very severe pressure from below, or does not mean anything, as, for example, the N.U.R. resolution on the six-hour day.

It would appear that the fates have determined to show up the muddling methods of the British Labour movement, somewhat more than usual on this occasion. Here is a Trades Union Congress, which, by no manner of means can detach itself from political events of first class importance, meeting a month before the Labour Party Conference. Is not this putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance? Where is the Labour Party leadership? Have the unions paid their affiliation fees to be placed in the muddled position of perhaps coming to decisions at the Trades Union Congress, which may be in flat contradiction to the Labour Party decision in October? or, has the Labour Party decided to take its political lead from the Trades Union Congress?

If the Trades Union Congress was the serious business that it ought to be, then these questions would be serious questions, but the fact that nobody really worries as to which meets first, the political party or the Trades Union Congress, or cares very much what the decisions of the Trades Union Congress may be, only serves to show the backwardness of the general political development of the working class in this country.

WANTED: A GENERAL STAFF.

The movement gropes along without any guiding principles. It refuses to analyse its own position, abhors bold comprehensive policies, and prefers to emulate the snail. The role of a political party is limited to parliamentary operations. The role of the Unions is confined to sectional wage negotiations, insurance and recruiting means for ambitious parliamentarians.

So long as these conditions obtain, and the leadership is in the hands of those who refuse to recognise the class war, the vital role of a political party as a leader of the political class war will pass unrecognised, and the strength of the Trade Union Congress, as a powerful means of mobilising the workers for united class action remains only as a potentiality. And, we venture to assert that until there is a powerful Communist Party the potentialities of the Trades Union Congress will not be translated into daily realities, nor will the leadership of the working class be other than the present muddle-headed business which tries to serve contradictory forces—encouraging the workers to improve their conditions, and blacklegging on them when they try to do it.

Meanwhile, there are resolutions on the agenda which have been pressed up from below, that are helpful in the purpose of transforming the Congress. For years we have urged the creation of a "General Staff" for the whole Trade Union movement. That agitation made itself felt until the Parliamentary Commit-

tee of the Trades Union Congress assumed the name of "General Council of the Trades Union Congress." This was acclaimed as the "General Staff," but a blind man can see that it was no such thing, however high sounding its name. Our campaign continued, and resolutions are before the Congress to increase the power to act in all disputes, and bring the united forces of the unions behind the workers in the forefront of the struggle. The plea of union autonomy will be brought against these proposals as if "autonomy" had not severely thrashed every union in the country during the last few years.

Resolutions are also demanding the affiliation of the Trades Council, the Unemployed Workers' Committees, and that every trade group on the General Council shall have "at least one representative who is a bona-fide worker engaged at the trade or entitled to donation benefit." We hope all these resolutions will be passed by the Congress in order to bring it nearer to the actual struggles of the workers, and to make possible in the near future the transformation of the Trades Union Congress into an effective instrument in the workers' fight.

We value these resolutions because they strike at the conservatism of the Congress, and are blows directed in order to liberate the workers and free them for action.

PUSH THAT CHARTER.

Nothing could emphasise the need for this better than the manner in which the General Council presents its Seven-point Charter. After placing on its programme "the nationalisation of land, mines, and minerals and railways," etc., it descends to the level of a mere propaganda society. "This Congress decides that it shall be the duty of the General Council to institute a vigorous campaign in all parts of the country, with a view to mobilising public opinion in support of the objects of the Charter and of their fulfilment."

It appears from the manner in which this Charter is put forward, that the General Council is not serious about these proposals, that they have simply asked Mr. Bramley to draw together the resolutions that continue to appear at each Congress, to bunch them together in order to dismiss them. We expect if this is the attitude of the Council (and upon this matter we would like to hear from the "left-wing" Messrs. John Bromley, George Hicks, Robert Smillie, Wm. Hutchinson, and Co.) that whenever the Minority Committee puts forward their demands we shall get the classic formal reply: "Yes, you are quite right, it is already in our Charter." And then further slumber! If this is not to be

the case, when did the Trade Union movement surrender its industrial power as a means of making governments and political parties sit up, and give attention. If the General Council is not playing with the Congress, and the Congress means business, then they will strengthen their resolution and their intentions by insisting that the programme is serious enough to warrant every means at the disposal of the unions being used to achieve it as early as possible, otherwise the resolution is a clear indication that the intention of the General Council is to use the unions only as a propaganda apparatus for the Parliamentary Labour Party.

This seems to us to be their real attitude on most questions, as again illustrated in their proposals with regard to the Trades Councils. Instead of seeing in these organisations the possibilities of making them what they used to be—fighting organs of the workers, uniting the unions locally on a broad class basis, they propose to use them simply as distributive machinery for the literature of the General Council. Instead of stimulating the life and activity of the masses and drawing them into a general mass movement, they seek to stifle, to resolutionise the masses into a state of pathetic pacifist somnolence, which will enable them to take the hard knocks of the bosses graciously as “by kind permission.”

WELCOME! THE RUSSIAN DELEGATES.

It is with joy that we turn to welcome the delegates of the Russian Trade Unions. We welcome them not only because they are comrades who have come through the strife of revolution, and who have no illusions as to the class character of the workers' war on capitalism, but because their presence here is a clear indication of the great changes coming in the international union movement, and within the ranks of British trade unionism.

For seven years the Russian trade unions have been isolated—and let the fundamental reason of their isolation be perfectly clear. They were isolated because they had defeated their oppressors, the landlords and the capitalists, and dared to stand fast by the revolution they had achieved. When all the formal talk concerning this and that, constitution is reduced to its essentials, this one big fact stares us in the face. The International Federation of Trade Unions, which has achieved no revolution, which, indeed, has striven to prevent revolution, in all the countries of its affiliated organisations, has been striving with all its strength to detach the Russian Unions from their revolutionary purpose, and to insist upon them retreating to the position of class collaboration and social pacifism taken up by

the Amsterdam International. Throughout the last seven years, the Russian unions have refused, and refuse to-day, to surrender the real gains of the proletarian revolution for the illusions of the Thomas' and MacDonalds'.

What then is the meaning of their presence at the Hull Congress?

They are here because of the vast changes in the world situation since the 1917 revolution, and the changes that have taken place in the proletarian movement. To-day, there is no question as to the stability of the U.S.S.R. The workers' republic conquered her internal foes, and forced her external foes to cease military intervention. Arising out of these victories, more and more of the capitalist states have come to terms.

During this transition the Russian unions have grown in strength and purpose. They have gathered round them, in the R.I.L.U. increasing numbers of allies. These allies were workers within the ranks of the Amsterdam International. The whole of the European economic and political development during the same period urged on the process of weakening the position of the reactionaries in the unions. The German trade unions, which have held the lead of Amsterdam International, crumbled amidst the economic disasters created by the conflicts between the Imperialists, aided and abetted by the reactionary union leaders. The hegemony of the International Federation of Trade Unions passed into the hands of the British Trade Unions. The reins of government fell into the hands of the British Labour Party, and the Second International, and with this transformation of the scene it was immediately apparent that the Labour movement was not in complete accord with the surrender of the "right" wing of the Labour Party to Imperialism.

TOWARDS INTERNATIONAL UNITY.

Especially was this felt in the trade unions, which were nearer to the every-day struggles of the workers, than the middle class leaders of the Labour Party. Here, the class interests of the workers immediately manifested themselves, and such men as Purcell, Bromley, Hutchinson, Hicks and Williams, began to sound a critical warning note to move nearer to the position of our party, and echo the demand that the workers of Europe come together for common defence, and for a united forward movement against capitalism.

The presence of our Russian comrades at Hull is a continuation of that process—the bringing together of the unions of revolu-

tion with workers of the British trade unions, who have yet to face the difficulties the Russian unions have overcome.

No moment could be more opportune for their presence. Now, when the Imperial Labour Government of Britain has committed itself to the policy of the Wall Street bankers of America, when, through the pressure of the proletariat of this country, the Anglo-Russian Treaty has been signed; when the Imperialists are preparing for new wars as fast as possible, what greater opportunity could present itself than this, for the trade unions of Britain to declare that no obstacle shall be permitted to stand in the way of the British and Russian trade unions jointly taking a leading part in the making of a single international federation of trade unions, pledged to fight the workers' battles, free from the influence and permeation of such capitalist institutions as the League of Nations? This is indeed, an appropriate moment, and we shall await the decision of the British trade unions on this question with great interest, confident that an affirmative answer, a ready response to the call for workers' solidarity by a deed of this description is the sure guarantee that the remainder of their difficulties will be overcome.

J. T. MURPHY.



The Sudan Scandal

AT the end of their first six months of office we find the British Labour Government—despite its pacifist affiliations—busily engaged in upholding the Empire, by force and arms. Aircraft are busy in Trans-jordania and Iraq, and warships and troops are being dispatched to the Sudan. Something very near to an ultimatum has been dispatched to Egypt, and the outcry from the City against the Treaty with Russia and from Fleet Street against the withdrawal of the prosecution of the *Workers' Weekly* gives place to unstinted praise from the *Times* for the “firmness” of the Government stand over the Sudan.

Thomas Johnston, editor of *Forward*, who is regarded by many as the leader of the Left-wing of the Labour Party in Parliament finds himself in an awkward predicament. He it was who first drew public attention to the “scandal” of a loan guaranteed to the Sudan Government by the British Government. He protested that it was a use of public money for the advantage, first of the financiers who negotiated the loan, and, secondly, of a syndicate of cotton planters who were granted a monopoly for the development of cotton growing in the area. Incidentally, he also charged Mr. Asquith (who had busied himself to secure the support of the British Government for the scheme) with having a family interest in the scheme, and the Tory Government with being interested to secure a fat contract for a stout supporter—Lord Cowdray.

The “scandal” blew over at the time, but subsequent developments have given the Egyptian Government a standing that they did not then possess, and they are using it to protest against the separation of the Sudan from Egypt, and the exploitation of its resources in such a way as to seriously menace the economic stability of Egypt itself.

Reminded of his former stand, Mr. Johnston shifts his front. The scheme which he denounced has been inherited by the Labour Government. Faced with the protest of the Egyptian Government and a mutiny of an Egyptian railway battalion, used for railway construction in the Sudan, the British Government “takes a firm stand” and Mr. Johnston ranges himself on their side.

Mr. Johnston, who is worth taking trouble over since many

regard him as the chief of the "revolutionaries" from the Clyde, and the one who will in time lead the opposition to the imperialism of Thomas, Henderson and MacDonald, has, it would seem, succumbed to the mental distortion which has become chronic in Parliamentary circles since the opening of the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley.

THE WEMBLEY SQUINT.

It is a frame of mind which conceives the British Empire as purely and simply a territorial extension of the authority of the British House of Commons, and its offshoots, the Parliaments of the self-governing Dominions. It is admitted that five-sixths of the adult inhabitants of the Empire have not even the pretence of a Parliamentary vote, and that all but a microscopic fraction of these are whites. It is admitted, too (since it cannot be denied) that of the 470 million inhabitants of the Empire, 320 millions are Indians and that only a few hundred thousand of these have even a consultative vote in the Government of India. These things are awkward, but are easily got into a rosy focus by the victim of the "Wembley squint." In time—"when they are fit for it"—these will have a vote too, and then all will be well. "Under Socialist inspiration, with Home Rule all round and a federated Parliament for the Empire," says Johnston, in a fever of exaltation, "the British Empire might be made the greatest lever for emancipation the world has ever known."

The essential fallacy of patriotic reformism lies in dividing politics and economics into two sharply distinguished categories, with only an incidental connection between them. They do not say "capitalism needeth 'democracy,' 'representative government,' and 'parliamentary institutions,' and, therefore, we have them." They say, capitalism has "corrupted" Parliament, democracy and representative institutions. They do not say "the Empire exists as an expression of capitalism in its final finance-monopoly form." They say (as Johnston is learning to say) how nice the Empire would be if only we could keep the capitalists from being quite so all-pervasive.

Johnston clinches the matter by formulating the whole Sudan question as a question between British and Egyptian Imperialism—with the League of Nations in the background as a final arbitrator. He has no conception of the fact that the Sudan to-day is a totally different thing from what it will be in 10 years time—no inkling of the processes at work transforming the Sudanese from self-governing peasants into first tenant-cultivators, exploited by the Sudan Government and a British syndicate in conjunction,

and finally, into proletarians whose future will be identified with that of the proletarians of all lands.

For him the whole question is simply "shall we break up the Empire?—or shall we thank God that we are not as other men are, and trust that our moral superiority will reconcile the subject races of Africa, Asia and Polynesia to any little inconveniences that arise from "our" exploitation of them?"

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SUDAN.

As between the Egyptian and British Governments, the issue is quite simple. The British went into the Sudan as the agents of the Khedive of Egypt, flying the Egyptian flag (as well as the British) and in two expeditions (1885 and 1895-98) secured, first, the retirement of the Egyptian garrisons besieged by the Sudanese "rebels," and, secondly, the reconquest of the province for and in the name of the Khedive of Egypt.

Every British soldier who took part in those campaigns received a medal from the Khedive as well as one from the British Government. Kitchener was in command of the army that effected the re-conquest by the authority of (and was paid by) the Khedive of Egypt.

It is true that all through this episode Egypt was a British "Protectorate." True, also, that Egypt was "annexed" during the war. But these facts must be interpreted in the light of the oft-repeated promises of British statesmen, that the occupation was only "temporary" and, that once the claims of the bondholders had been satisfied and the Suez Canal made secure as a passage for British ships, the British would honour their obligations and withdraw. Now the British have (more or less) withdrawn. Egypt is nominally free and independent. Is it strange that Egyptian Nationalists should claim that the whole pretence of withdrawal is made into a cynical farce if the Sudan is finally separated from Egypt and retained as a British possession?

What is the motive for retaining the Sudan? Thomas Johnston and the *Times* are for once agreed. Much antiquarian research has revealed the fact that the revolt of the Sudanese under the Mahdi (1882) was provoked by the brutality and oppression of the Egyptian Pashas. Were it not for the British they would, it seems, go back to their old slave-raiding tricks.

It seems strange that it should be left till now to discover this grave moral dilemma. The British Government invaded Egypt in 1882 and rescued these same Pashas from the popular vengeance of revolt headed by Arabi Pasha. They permitted the sending of English officers (Gordon, Baker and others), to the

Sudan to help establish their rule, and an expeditionary force to rescue them from Sudanese vengeance.

They placed in the Egyptian service military and civil officers who planned and conducted the military campaign that destroyed the rule of the successful rebels, and finished up the campaign by solemnly blowing up the tomb of the Mahdi as a final expression of hatred for all that that revolt implied.

Now we learn that the revolt was thoroughly justified, and to punish the sons of the "slave-raiding Pashas," the British Government proposes to hold the country against the Egyptians at all costs. It seems unnecessary to add that we are assured that the Sudanese are eager for the British Government to remain.

THE SYMPATHY FOR THE SUDANESE.

What has caused this sudden outbreak of sympathy for the once-contemned "fuzzy-wuzzy"? And this equally sudden repudiation of the Egyptian Pashas—who were, by the way, preserved along with the rest of the Anglo-Egyptian establishment by the suppression of the revolt of the Egyptian peasants in 1919.

Johnston knows the answer better than anybody. Up to 1900 the prime concern of British capitalism (beyond the claims of the bondholders and the safety of the Suez Canal) was the Cape to Cairo railway. For this the Sudan was merely a part of the route. From the Cairo end of the line it was part of Egypt, from the Cape end both were part of the Empire. British and Egyptian financial interests were at one.

But after 1900, the British Empire began to face an increasing shortage of cotton very damaging to the prosperity of Lancashire. The U.S.A. was more and more using up its native crop at home, less and less was available for export. Egypt was a suitable land for cotton growing. Egypt became dearer to the Empire than ever.

After the building of the great barrage at Assuan, on the Lower Nile, and the valuable results in cotton cultivation that it made possible, speculation soon hit upon the Sudan and the Upper Nile as the field of a possibly still more profitable venture. There were developed schemes for irrigation and cultivation in the Sudan which culminated in the formation of the Sudan Plantations Syndicate, and the Sudan Loan.

The purpose of the loan was the development of cotton growing by irrigation in two districts of the Sudan. One required a new railway to bring its crop to the sea at Port Sudan. It was built. The other required a dam across the Blue Nile in order to turn the whole area between it and the White Nile into an area

of cultivation under irrigation. This dam is in process of construction. The railway (from Kassala to Port Sudan) was built by the Sudan Government from the loan supplied by the British Government under the Trade Facilities Act. The dam is being built under contract out of the proceeds of the same loan.

British financiers make a profit on floating the loan. British capitalists make a profit on laying the railway and constructing the dam, and at the end of the period the railway belongs for a term of years to a cotton syndicate, the dam belongs to the cotton syndicate, and the peasants have become occupying tenants, exploited at will by, and at the mercy of, the cotton syndicate!

When the British Government talks of "keeping a firm grip on the Sudan," it means in plain words to protect the field of exploitation of a great cotton growing syndicate—regardless of the consequences to the peasantry, whether in Egypt or the Sudan.

THE POSITION OF EGYPT.

The Egyptian attitude to the question is easily explained. There the peasantry are so ruthlessly exploited by the land companies (to whom they are the occupying tenants) that only by an artificial curtailment of the area under cultivation can the peasant manage to bear the enormous rents imposed upon him.

The development of the Sudan threatens this monopoly at its root. The price of cotton will be at the mercy of the British syndicates as soon as the area has been sufficiently developed. What is even more vital—there is no guarantee that the development of irrigation in the Sudan may not cut off the very Nile flood upon which Egypt depends for its existence.

The conclusion is clear. British Imperialism never retreats except to get a firmer grip. British Imperialism has a more deadly hold over Egypt to-day than it ever had, and the clash between British and Egyptian capitalism is part of the process which will sooner or later bring on the end.

It is not a question whether British Imperialism should be preferred to Egyptian. The question is—when will the workers and peasants end both together?

THOS. A. JACKSON.

Lenin . . On Insurrection

THE publication in French of this book of Lenin's, which contains nearly all the pamphlets and leading articles he wrote from the end of August to the middle of October, 1917, has given to the French comrades an inexhaustible source of revolutionary teachings.

An incomparable work in Communist literature has become accessible to us all. It is not to be compared even with such works of Marx as, "*The Class War in France*," "*The 18th Brumaire*," "*Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany*," and the "*Civil War in France*."

In the first three of these books, and partly in the fourth, we see the founder of scientific Socialism plunging into the depths of past revolutions, determining the economic basis, clearly analysing the interests of the classes and deducting from these revolutions of the past, teachings for *those to come*.

In his "*Insurrection*," Lenin shows himself as the leader of an *imminent Revolution* which he is preparing and directing (from his hiding place) with unequalled audacity and genius.

LETTER TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

From the first of the many letters he wrote (letter to the Central Committee of the Party, written in the last days of August), Lenin comes out in all his greatness and tenacity.

The situation is difficult—the rising of Korniloff, the fall of Riga, Petrograd in peril—these events do not fail to influence even a section of the members of the Bolshevik Party in whom a certain hesitation manifests itself.

It is then, that Lenin—as his illegality prevented him from appearing openly—intervenes by this letter, which explains clearly the situation to the Party, and shows it the tactics to follow.

"As with any sudden change of policy," writes Lenin, "it needs a revision of tactics. And as in every revision, one must be extremely prudent in order not to err in principles.

"To admit the point of view of National Defence or go so far as to form a bloc with the social revolutionaries to support the Provisional Government is to make the biggest mistake. We shall only become partisans to National Defence *after* the taking of power by the proletariat, after the offer of Peace, after the cancellation of the secret treaties and of the relations with the banks. Neither the fall of Riga, nor the fall of Petrograd, will make us partisans of National Defence."

And a few lines further on :

" *Even now* we must not support the Revolution of Kerensky. It would mean abandoning our principles. To fight against Kornilov, certainly, but between combating Kornilov and supporting Kerensky, there is a difference.

" We are fighting and shall continue to fight against Kornilov, but we are not supporting Kerensky, we are revealing his weaknesses. That is a difference. That difference is subtle enough, but very essential and must not be lost sight of." (Pages 7 and 8.)

The change of tactics—such is the sense in which Lenin writes—does not consist primarily in the immediate removal of the Kerensky Government, but to reveal its weaknesses and its hesitations ; secondly to push forward " the temporary demands " such as the arrest of Milioukow and Rodzianko, and of all generals and officers who sided with Kornilov ; the arming of the Petrograd workers, the dissolution of the Duma, the legislation for the transfer of the big estates to the peasants, etc. We have to encourage the masses to urge the immediate realisation of such demands. Lenin said, that it is in the war against Kornilov that the masses will best see the weakness, the treasons, the vacillation of the Kerensky Government, and that they will become convinced of the correctness of the Bolshevik slogans. It is for this reason he urges that the war be waged energetically so that developments can bring the Bolsheviks to power.

ON COMPROMISE.

The second article of the series is a model of Leninist strategy, and we think that it supplies us with excellent advice for the practical application of the United Front.

On the 31st of August, the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries voted, in the Petrograd Soviet, for a Bolshevik resolution against the participation of the cadets (middle-class) in the Government, and declaring that " the ultimate issue is the constitution of a government formed with the representatives of the proletariat and of the peasant class."

But Lenin does not give them time to breathe. He proposes immediately a compromise, viz., to form a government responsible before the Soviets. " It is only exceptionally, and in virtue of a special situation which, very likely, will not last long, that we can propose a compromise to those Parties and that we have, so it seems to me, to do so."

" This compromise would consist in this, that without seeking government participation, the Bolsheviks would renounce their claim for the immediate cession of power to the proletariat and poor peasants, and to employ revolutionary methods to secure that demand. But in return, it would claim an entire freedom of agitation and the convocation of the Constituent Assembly at the date previously fixed or even sooner.

The Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries, in such a Coalition government, would consent to compose a government entirely and exclusively responsible before the Soviets to whom would be transmitted all the apparatus of power."

That is the "New Condition" that Lenin presents to them and he adds no other.

In such a compromise, explains Lenin, the two parties will gain :

"The Bolsheviks, in that sense that they would obtain the right of propagating freely their point of view, and the possibility of exercising their influence inside the Soviets, thanks to the effective realisation of integral Democracy.

"The Mensheviks and the S.R. would gain in the compromise, in this sense, that they would obtain at once the possibility of realising the programme of their bloc, resting on the immense majority of the people, and in assuring for themselves the right of utilising ("pacifically") their majority in the Soviets." (Pages 12 & 13.)

Whilst reading these lines, we seem to see the smiling eyes of Lenin, and to hear him murmur: the only consistent feature of the temperament and policy of these poor little Hamlets' is their perpetual hesitation and their astounding fear of the masses. Very probably they will refuse this compromise.

In that case, we shall have won. We shall be able then to convince the masses easily that the Mensheviks and S.R.'s are only bravadoes. But even in considering the improbable supposition of their accepting the compromise out of fears for a Bolshevik insurrection, even in that case, we shall have won, because then the masses will be convinced by their own experience that the programme of that coalition is only a farce. They will understand the correctness of our programme.

ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF THE REVOLUTION.

In the third article, Lenin puts before us the alternative; either dissolution of the Soviets, and their inglorious end, or all power to the Soviets.

But unfortunately, said Lenin, the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" is nearly always understood in the sense of a Ministerial Cabinet, composed of the parties forming the majority in the Soviets, and this would only be a change of persons without destroying the old state machinery. Such an interpretation of the slogan is absolutely erroneous. A social change cannot be realised with the old State apparatus.

"Such an apparatus could serve a republican bourgeoisie under the form of "Monarchy without a Monarch," as the third Republic of France, but it is absolutely incapable to realise any reforms, I do not say abolishing, but simply limiting in a way, more or less effective, the rights of capital and the "sacred" rights of private property." (Page 20.)

The slogan "All Power to the Soviets" signifies the abolition of the old State apparatus and substituting for it a new one, the Soviets. But the fact that the S.R.'s and the Mensheviks have no faith in the masses, fearing their initiative and trembling before

their revolutionary energy, has prevented up to now the destruction of the old State apparatus, and its substitution by a new one. It is that fear of the masses that has alone rendered possible the rising of Kornilov, and explains why Kerensky was able to restore "Kornilovism." It is why the dilemma is as follows: All power to the Soviets or the triumph of the Reaction.

Seven years of experience have only confirmed the correctness of this exposure. The Social Democrats have everywhere had to suffer the most shameful bankruptcy of their ideals, wherever they tried to utilise the old State apparatus on behalf of the proletariat, and their fear of the masses and of their revolutionary energy, has brought the triumph of the worst reaction in Hungary, in Italy, in Germany, etc.

To-day, as hitherto, it is the same dilemma: dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasants, or the triumph of reaction.

THE BOGEY OF CIVIL WAR.

In this article, Lenin, with great precision, refutes the point of view that one dare not go too far towards the Revolution in case that civil war drowned in "rivers of blood" the revolutionary conquests.

Analysing with extreme clearness the development of the revolution for six months, he demonstrates that civil war has brought no weakening, but on the contrary an increase in the consciousness, and of the organisation of the proletarian movement.

You are talking of civil war—such is the language Lenin speaks—but there are means to prevent it. There are the alliance of the Mensheviks and S.R. with the Bolsheviks, that is to say, the immediate transference of all power to the Soviets. The bourgeoisie will not be able to fight against such a coalition, as after the Kornilov adventure, it will not be able to recruit any more reckless divisions.

Truly the pacific development of any revolution is, generally speaking, an extremely rare and difficult thing, because revolution is the culminating point of class antagonisms; but in an agrarian country, where the alliance of the proletariat and the peasants can give *peace* to the masses exhausted by a criminal and unjust war, and *all the land* to the peasants, at such an historical and exceptional moment, the pacific development of the revolution would be possible and probable if all power were given to the Soviets. (Page 39.)

But if the S.R.'s and the Mensheviks continue their policy of vacillation, then civil war is inevitable.

"You are speaking of rivers of blood, caused by civil war," says Lenin, "but those rivers of blood would give the victory to the proletariat and the poor peasants, and that victory would have ninety-nine chances out of a hundred to substitute *peace* for the imperialist war; that is to say, to economise the lives of *hundreds of thousands* of men, who are now shedding their blood in order to decide the question of the sharing of the profits and territorial conquests (annexations) of the capitalists. That the movement of the 20th-21st

of April ended by giving all power to the Soviets and given, in the Soviets, the victory to the Bolsheviks allied to the poor peasants, this taking over of the power, supposing it had brought about 'rivers of blood' would have saved the lives of the *half-million soldiers* that the disastrous offensive of August 18th cost us." (Page 42.)

The argument that one could not entertain the idea of a revolution, because civil war may drown all revolutionary conquests in "rivers of blood," is reiterated over and over again, even to-day by the social-traitors of every country. They have even divided it in two parts. First, "Every attempt to plunge into the revolution must upset social order, and may encourage the bourgeoisie to annihilate the revolutionary conquests." A short scrutiny of the situation of the proletariat in Austria, where Otto Bauer, the principal author of this equilibristic theory lives, in Germany and in France, to speak only of these three countries, gives exactly an idea of the value of the argument. The bourgeoisie has not bothered itself, and does not care about "the social equilibrium," and of the "theory of restriction" of the "learned know-nothings of the Second International," as Lenin expresses it. The bourgeoisie has wrested and is still wresting from the proletariat, one after the other, the concessions they may have made out of fear of a revolution.

Secondly, every attempt to plunge into the revolution must finally end in civil war, which will bring "rivers of blood." But, may we say in accord with Lenin, those rivers of blood will assure the victory of the workers and peasants, permanent peace, and by that economise millions of lives and oceans of blood.

MARXISM AND INSURRECTION.

Extremely interesting and instructive is the letter written by Lenin to the Central Committee during the democratic conference. Lenin is full of haste, because an offensive by the Germans on Petrograd is feared, and it is certain that Rodzianko and his consorts are ready to deliver the Red town to the Germans. Lenin knows very well that the fall of Petrograd, which the army of Kerensky would be powerless to prevent, would diminish considerably the chance of the Bolsheviks. On the other hand, the situation has turned rather in favour of the Bolsheviks, they have obtained the majority in the Soviets of Moscow and Petrograd. And also the Mensheviks and S.R.'s have refused the compromise offered by the Bolsheviks. This is the reason why Lenin advises the Party to commence as quickly as possible armed insurrection, and to take control of the Power. He recalls at the same time that "armed insurrection is an art."

But is not the starting of an insurrection but pure "blan-

quism"? Lenin answers that objection in the letter mentioned. Three points distinguish Marxism from Blanquism in the question of insurrection. Here they are :

"According to Marx, the insurrection must look for support not on a conspiracy, not on a party, but on the advanced class. This is the first point. It must look for support on the revolutionary urge of the people. This is the second point. The insurrection must start at the top of the ascending revolution, so to say, at the moment when the activity of the advance guard of the people is the strongest, when the *vacillation amongst the enemies and amongst the irresolute and weak friends of the revolution are the strongest*; this is the third point." (Pages 59 & 60.)

Lenin declares that those three conditions are now fulfilled by the Bolsheviks.

In reality, we have with us the majority of the proletarian *class*, of the advance guard of the revolution, of the advance guard of the people, capable of enthusing the masses. We have with us the majority of the people, because the resignation of Tchernov is, amongst others, the best proof, the strongest evidence that the bloc of the S.R.'s (or even the S.R.'s left to themselves) will never give the land to the peasants.

And in this lies the fundamental cause of the essentially popular character of the revolution.

"We have the advantage of the position of our Party which alone amidst the inordinate fluctuations of the *Imperialist*, and of the *Menshevik S.R.* coalition, goes forward with firmness in the path it has marked out for itself.

We have the *victory assured*, because the people are reduced to despair, and we alone have shown them the real issue in explaining the importance of our direction "in the day of Kornilov," and in proposing afterwards a compromise to the coalitionists who refused it, but who remain tossed up in their never-ending hesitations.

And because of such existing conditions, it would mean treason to Marxism and revolution not to consider insurrection as an art.

It is only by a victorious insurrection that our Party will save Petrograd. Because, if the offered Peace was refused to us, if we did not obtain even an armistice, "we shall become the most militarist Party," we shall wage war in a really revolutionary way. We shall take all the bread and all the boots from the capitalists. We shall only give them the crumbs and supply them with clogs. All the bread and the boots will be for those at the front.

But there are 99 chances out of 100 that the Germans will grant us at least an Armistice. "To obtain an Armistice means vanquishing the world."

Lenin, who knows, that in action those hesitating in our own ranks might cause an enormous disaster, and that quantity does not come before quality, writes:—

We must, at the Conference, proceed immediately to solidify the Bolshevik fraction, and for that purpose not look for quantity, not to hesitate to leave those hesitating into the ranks of the hesitants. They will be more useful for the cause of the revolution there, than in the camp of the resolute and devoted combatants. (Page 63.)

After presenting a short resume of our point of view on the

situation, and of our demands to the Conference "we shall have to launch all our fraction in the factories and the barracks: there is its place, there is the most vital point."

There, we must, in ardent speeches, put the question as follows: the complete acceptance of our programme or insurrection.

"The question being put as such, all our fraction being concentrated in the factories and barracks, we shall be able to judge and decide the moment when the insurrection will take place." (Page 64.)

We believe that it would be very useful if the Party leadership were to publish this letter, the principal ideas of which we have developed with appropriate comments in the form of a leaflet, and invite all the comrades to read it with attention, and organise discussions on the subject. The events of October in Germany have shown the primordial necessity for a Communist Party to understand all the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the question of insurrection.

WILL THE BOLSHEVIKS RETAIN THE POWER?

In this pamphlet, published also in this series, Lenin discusses the attitude of the several parties, and of the tendencies on the question of the capture and the retention of power by the Bolsheviks. In the attitude of the S.R.'s and the Cadets, he sees nothing but threats to intimidate, and it is only in the attitude of the *Novaia Sizm*, the organ of Gorki and of the group of intellectuals who were the nearest to the Bolsheviks, and who were forming "a partial coalition in the bosom of democracy," that he saw the six following arguments.

1. The proletariat is isolated from all other classes in the country.
2. It is "isolated from the real live forces of democracy."
3. It will not be able, technically speaking, to take the State apparatus in hand.
4. It will not be able to start this apparatus.
5. The "situation is exceptionally complicated."
6. It "will not be able to resist the push of the enemy forces, which will sweep away not only the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also the revolution." (Pages 115 and 116.)

Lenin knows that a section of the Bolsheviks is in sympathy with the *Novaia Sizm* and because of that the arguments of that organ must be crushed.

The answer of Lenin to the first argument amounts to this: "You say that the proletariat is isolated from "the other classes." But what do you mean by "the other classes"? There are as everyone knows, only three classes, the proletariat, the bourgeoisie, and the small bourgeoisie. That the proletariat should be isolated from the bourgeoisie, which seeks to crush it, is natural. But is it not ridiculous to speak of "the isolation

of the proletariat" from the peasants, when—figures can prove it—the majority of the peasants have shown themselves in favour of the proletarian slogan: against the coalition with the bourgeoisie? Has the proletariat not behind itself the majority of the people, on the agrarian question, on the question of nationalities, on peace? The people of the *Novaia Siza* have *hit the wrong nail*," with their isolation of the proletariat.

Now to the second argument, "The proletariat is isolated from the real live forces of democracy." What are these "forces"? Those of the Cadets, the Brechkovkaia, the Plekhanovo, the Kerensky and others! But they are inert forces. The history of the coalition proved it.

That the proletariat—answers Lenin to the third argument—could not simply take over the State apparatus (above all the permanent army, the police and the State functionaries), all that has been proved long ago by Marx.

"But it can *smash* all that oppresses and paralyzes, everything, in fact, essentially bourgeois in the old State machinery, and put in its place a new apparatus which shall be its own. That apparatus is the Soviets of deputies of the Workers, Soldiers and Peasants. (Page 122.)

Let us pass on to the fourth argument, the proletariat "will not be able to start that apparatus."

"No doubt," says Lenin, "we should not be able ourselves to seize the State apparatus, nor to start it. The new apparatus, the Soviets is already in action. That apparatus functions already; it only wants to be eased of that burden of the petit bourgeoisie, of those bonds that prevent it from going forward at full speed." (Page 128.)

Capitalism has created in its stadium of imperialist wars, some food monopolies, the system of bread-cards and compulsory labour service. This will be in the hands of the Soviets, the surest means of registration and control, and will enable us to triumph over the capitalist resistance.

Those means of control and of *compulsory labour*, is more powerful than all the laws of the Convention and its guillotine. The guillotine only terrified, smashing the *active* resistance; this does not satisfy us.

The *passive* resistance, incontestably more dangerous and more nefarious must be smashed. We have not only to overwhelm all possibility of resistance, but we must force our adversaries to work in the frame of the new organisation of the State. (Page 129.)

By those means, we must fight not only the capitalists, but also the upper class of the intellectuals and bourgeois employees, etc. Every rich person shall receive from his trade union, corresponding as near to his work as possible, an employment book, and every week, for instance, a certificate indicating whether he has rendered his work conscientiously or not. If he has not done so, he shall have no bread, no food. He who works not shall not eat.

"The proletariat," says Lenin, "shall not be able, so we are told, to start the State apparatus."

After the 1905 Revolution, 130,000 aristocrats have governed Russia in molesting with continuous violence 150 millions, compelling the immense majority of the people to work like convicts, and for a bare existence. And the 240,000 members of the Bolshevik Party could not govern Russia in the interest of the working class against the wealthy people! These 240,000 men have already a million of adepts, at least. We are already in possession of a State apparatus of a *million* men whose devotion to the Socialist State is based on reasons of a moral order and not on the expectation of a big sum coming on the 20th of each month.

Moreover, we have yet a more marvellous means of *increasing* at once our State apparatus tenfold; means that no capitalist State has ever been able to dispose of, nor shall ever be able to. These means are the participation of the workers, of the poor classes in the daily administration of the State." (Pages 131 and 132.)

We come now to the fifth argument: The Bolsheviks will not be able to keep the power as "the situation is exceptionally complicated." If the situation is exceptionally complicated if the revolution was a process unfolding itself quietly and peacefully, then naturally, they would be for the revolution. But there is no revolution without an extremely complex situation: "Omelettes cannot be made without breaking eggs."

Sixth and last argument: the proletariat will not be able to resist the push of the enemy forces, which will sweep not only the dictatorship of the proletariat but also the revolution.

"Do not try to frighten us, gentlemen, you will not succeed! We have seen those enemy forces and their drive in the days of Kornilov (of whom Kerensky is the best imitator). Now the proletariat and the peasants have overwhelmed the supporters of Kornilov, in what a pitiful and lamentable position the followers of the bourgeoisie and the few representatives of the small landed proprietors, particularly hostile to the revolution, have found themselves. We have seen it, and the people remember it, too." (Page 142.)

A new *putsch* by Kornilov will only see an enlarged edition of Vyborg, when on August 31st, fifteen Kornilov officers were thrown into the water and drowned. This force of resistance of capitalism, we have already seen it. It will stop at nothing, the most infamous lies, the vilest calumnies, military conspiracies to slander the Soviets—it has utilised all these means, and what a poor result! But the force of resistance of the proletariat and of the poor peasants we have not seen, or known it in all its fullness.

This force will not unfold itself in all its splendour whilst the power remains in their hands, and whilst dozens of millions of men, crushed by the misery and slavery of the capitalist system, do not feel that the supreme power in the State belongs to the oppressed classes, helping the poor people to fight the landed proprietors and the capitalists and *reduce to smithereens* their resistance of those last named. (Page 147.)

Then, against all the tens of thousands of enemies, in the open or hidden, actives or passives, will rise a million new fighters: fighters who had till then played no political role, who had spent their lives in suffering; who were despairing of themselves and of their class, and in whom all idea of freedom was

already extinguished. This is the answer of Lenin to the sixth argument, a reply whose correctness has been confirmed by the history of the fight of Soviet Russia against the whole capitalist world. This is the answer of a psychological genius, who has studied deeply the soul of the masses, and who saw some forces there, hidden to ordinary eyes, forces asleep for dozens, hundreds of years, that only needed waking up to be utilised for the proletarian revolution. Lenin dared to provoke that commotion and he has rendered invincible Soviet Russia.

(Translated from *Bulletin Communiste*.)

YOUR CLASS AND PARTY NEED YOU.

There are some who, sympathising with, and appreciating the Communist position, will call themselves Communist without realising that the first duty of a Communist is to become a member of the Communist Party.

ARE YOU AMONGST THESE ?

It should not be necessary to point out the value of organisation, that an unattached Communist is of much less value than one whose work is part of an organised effort.

Therefore, **DO YOUR DUTY,**

JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY NOW

APPLICATION FORM.

I wish to be a member of the Communist Party. Please put me in touch with local membership.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Fill in this form and give it to the comrade who sold you this *Review*, or to *Local Secretary*

Or to Albert Inkpin, Secretary, Communist Party, 16, King Street, London, W.C.2.

C. R. 5.



THE MARX AND ENGELS INSTITUTE AT MOSCOW.

The scientific and international propaganda of Marxism is in need of a critical and international edition of the complete works of Marx and Engels. The Marx and Engels Institute at Moscow, founded by the Communist Party of Russia, promises the realisation of such a project. This institute possesses the most complete manuscripts of all the works of Marx and Engels, and of several of the publications to which Marx and Engels contributed.

With regard to original documents, the Institute is richer than the archives of the Social-Democratic Party in Germany, to which a great many manuscripts were left. Comrade Riazonov has acquired, apart from the manuscripts found in the Social-Democratic archives, numerous pieces belonging to Lafargue and Bernstein, the letters of Marx and Engels to William Liebknecht, Bernstein and Kautsky, some in the original and some in photography.

The Institute possesses many manuscripts of publications previous to the published works of Marx and Engels. Indeed, the unedited documents in possession of the Institute are so numerous, and of such a value that their publication will certainly inaugurate a new epoch in the study of Marxism.

The publication of this critical and complete edition of the works of Marx and Engels, accompanied by scientific commentaries, histories and criticisms necessary for the diffusion of these works, constitutes an enormous tax upon vast resources, technical and personal, of the utmost competence.

100,000 VOLUMES.

The Institute was founded in 1920 by Riazonov, who is still director. It possesses a library of more than one hundred thousand volumes. The organisation of the Institute is divided into sections corresponding to the principal countries upon which Marx and Engels concentrated their activity and political influence, and to which they applied their historical studies, and into sections corresponding to the scientific domains embraced by the theoretical work of Marx and Engels.

The principal cabinets—apart from those in which we find the works, printed and in manuscript, of the two founders of scientific Communism, and those in the lecture hall—are the German, French, English and Russian; then the cabinets of Philosophy, of the philosophy of Law, Economy, the History of Socialist ideas, and of Anarchism and Sociology.

The Cabinets of the History of Ideas and Theoretical Study, are organised upon a comprehensive scale. The Cabinet of Philosophy comprises, besides the works of Historical Materialism, the Hegelian Literature (comprising the neo-Hegelian tendencies). The collection of publications upon Dialectical Materialism is the richest collection known. The theoretical section of Political Economy is systematised exactly according to the plan of Marx. The Cabinet of the History of Socialism possesses a rich literature upon Saint Simonism, Le Fourierism and of Owenism. Its inventory rivals the documents of the National Library of Paris, and of the British Museum.

The publications of the Institute in preparation must be considered as the preliminary work to the International edition of Marx and Engels. Amongst

the strictly scientific publications, we may cite the splendid edition of the Communist Manifesto, accompanied by the historical and theoretical commentaries of Riazanov, the works of Lafargue and of Kautsky, the complete works of Plekhanov, a series of documents upon the history of the Labour movement of the Occident, some choice works of Hegel, the Library of Materialism, the Monography of Feuerbach, by A. Deborine, the Marx and Engels archives, and finally the complete edition (in Russian) of the works of Marx and Engels. This edition will comprise 35 volumes, of which four have already appeared

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA.

Some Statistics.

The following statistics are taken from the report of Comrade Rykor to the Fifth Congress of the Communist International.

In 1920, industry in general only reached 15 per cent. of pre-war level. This year, 1924, it is 45 per cent. The figures vary in the respective industries. Thus electric is 90 per cent. of pre-war. The production of castings was 7,000,000 poods in 1920-21; to-day it has passed 35,000,000.

Parallel with the development of industry has grown the numbers of industrial workers. Towards the middle of 1922, the estimate of workers employed in industry was 1,260,000. To-day it is 1,600,000. This figure does not include 1,000,000 employed on the railways, nor does it include the mass of workers employed in commerce, public instruction, in bureaux or who are temporarily engaged in clearing the woods.

In the combustible industries from 1922 to February, 1924, the number of workers increased from 151,664 to 207,737. In metallurgy from 246,750 to 281,691. In textiles from 312,000 to 374,000 (this summer the textile industry has intensified its production 30 per cent. During the last fifteen months, the number of workers employed in the State industries has increased 20 per cent., i.e., to one-fifth.

The numbers unemployed fluctuate round 1,000,000; one-fourth of these are industrials, the rest are miscellaneous, such as liberal professions, artists, singers, speculators, etc., many of whom classified themselves to get the State privileges. The decrease in the over-staffed institutions of the numbers employed has given rise to unemployment amongst intellectuals and petty-bourgeois elements. Only 25 per cent. are industrials, 75 per cent. comprise these other elements.

THE WAGES QUESTION.

The purchasing power of wages varies between 65 to 75 per cent. pre-war. This figure does not include all kinds of privileges and favours to the workers, especially those employed in the municipal services.

During the last two years the average wage has increased two and one-half times. Since the Fourth Congress (one year and a half) it has passed from 40 per cent. to 65 and 70 per cent. pre-war. In the course of the next three months wages in the railway and textile industries (always very low paid under the Tsarist regime) will be increased 10 per cent.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE.

Private enterprise only totals 4 per cent. of all industrial production. These private enterprises employ no more than 17 workers each.

LOOK OUT FOR OCTOBER ISSUE!

Should the Communist Party be Liquidated?

A Reply to M. Phillips Price

The Forum

Under this heading readers of the "The Communist Review" are invited to send in letters or contributions on specific questions relating to the working class movement. The Editor does not guarantee publication, nor accept responsibility for the views expressed when published. No M.S.S. returned unless accompanied with stamped addressed envelope. All contributions should not exceed 750 words, be written in a clear hand, and signed.

TECHNICIANS VERSUS PROLETARIAT.

Since the Russian Revolution, students of history have visualised the possible rise of the last of subject classes, the proletariat, to power with the ultimate establishment of "classless society, Communism. Then like a ghost at a spiritualistic seance—comes the suggestion that the class whose time is ripening is the technician class.

Strangest of all things, this development is hailed and prophesied, of all people, by a Labour College lecturer in a training class for tutors. An able student of history from a working class standpoint, a Marxian expounding Marxism as such, this lecturer propounds to the students of his class, "one must not be misled into the vain hope that the proletariat will soon be marching to victory. To-morrow, he declares, is the day of the success of a new dominant class, the technicians!

WHO HAS THE BRAINS?

"On every side they are getting together, their contempt of the proletariat is manifest, their consciousness of the identity of their class interests is being made apparent. They are resisting the call of the capitalist to form into Fascist groups for the protection of capitalism, they are as scornful of the useless, wasteful uneconomic capitalist, as they are of Henry Dubbs.

"Their cry is: Our brains are what have caused the progress. Our brains are carrying on the directive work, we demand that we shall be recognised." Many of this type are seeing the value of the Labour Party as a stepping stone to political place for themselves, using the proletariat to their own ends. "And," adds our teacher, "the proletariat are too helpless and indolent to save themselves."

What say the Communists to this viewpoint? What of the aspirations of the proletariat? While it is sig-

nificant and true that there are indications amongst the inhabitants of suburbia, from the conversations in the morning trains, to discuss with growing apprehension for them the growth of the Communist Party, the revolt against the sane and safe (?) direction of the trade unions, the conscious grouping of the technicians has not yet taken concrete shape. Their Press is infinitesimal, their views lost in the clamour and clash of the struggle between worker (skilled and unskilled) and the employer.

But there is the prospect that they may yet combine in an effort to take in hand the leadership of the masses, with one aim in view, viz., once control has passed from the capitalist, they will assume direction and become the new class living on the toil of others.

But our friends who warn us of this tendency, fail to recognise the most important factor—and the only factor they will have to fear.

THE REAL TECHNICIANS.

It is the factor, which, under Lenin's leadership and guidance and faced in Russia, met the resistance of the technicians and subordinated them to the needs of the Revolution. That factor was the existence of a new group, the trained technicians of the Communist Party. Technicians, not as engineers, draughtsmen, medicos or such, but more powerful than all, technicians co-ordinating at all forms of social activity, technicians of the social revolution. There do we find the force which makes the rise of a new dominant class a bogey, an illusion, a sycophancy.

The "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," says our tutor friend, "is not yet, however earnestly to be desired."

There is arising, like the feudal lords, like the merchant class, like the capitalist class, a grouping of people conscious of the identity of their economic interests, scorning the capitalist with his Ascots and Rivierra's, etc., and the proletariat

with his lack of any interest other than the beer and the extra copper an hour can get him on "the first three." These are the people who are the rising class, these are the people who are going to dominate for several generations. "The Day," he declares, "of the capitalist is gone. Capitalism is dead, and in its place comes the domination of the technician class. That is the new phase, that and no other. There is no alternative. Surrounding that economic foundation you will get a new ideology, new legislation, new political conceptions, a new ethical outlook."

We are forced to query this, we are forced to ask ourselves, is this correct? What then, is the Communist reply?

Simply that, whatever the technicians may think of their superior brains, the workers are determined that they alone shall rule.

They see slowly and gradually developing, a trained group of men, knowing and understanding social organisation, with definite and clear-cut political ideals. Able, strong and reliant, ready to cut adrift—whatever the incidental consequences—any discordant elements, mental and manual, that try to disunite the workers in their determined march to the goal of Communism.

All Power to the Workers.

No technicians can carry on this work without the assistance of millions of unskilled. The unskilled work is part of and complementary to their work. The challenge of any group of technicians must be accepted by the co-ordinating elements of the new society, the technicians of the new social order.

These, as forecasted by Lenin, and as proven by the Russian Revolution, will undoubtedly be the trained, regimental and organised sections of the proletariat, who intend that the fruits of victory shall be only for the working class. As part of that class, the technicians may claim their share, according to their needs. After all, they are but specialists in their own particular sphere, jealous of their own special achievements. They are so much specialised in modern society that they are held apart. Social organisation alone holds them together. When the capitalist system has gone, they will still seek in the new system a co-ordinating in-

fluence. They will find it in fellow technicians—the technicians of the new social organisation. These technicians, however, will be inspired by one end, and one means to the end. The end—Communism; the means to the end—All Power to the Workers.

W. H. DEAS.

[The role and the importance of the technician class in Great Britain is modified by the experience, training and highly developed character of industrial organisation amongst the working class, whether skilled or unskilled. We need only contemplate how that in every workshop we have ready to hand an army of "leading-hands," petty foremen, overlookers and managers—all working men and women—who live for their job; to see, that, in addition to the army of well-trained toilers, the working class has all the brains at its command necessary for the running of the industries. Moreover, when we think of the army of well-trained officers in the industrial or trade unions, equipped with a knowledge of raw materials, sources of supplies, prices and general bookkeeping—all working men and women—the absurdity of the working class looking outside its own ranks for assistance to carry through the revolution is obvious.

The working class of this country possesses a rich experience and training which our comrades in Russia never had. With self-reliance, confidence and the will to action, the working class can win through in this country in defiance of the so-called technicians.—Editor.]

IMMEDIATE DEMANDS.

Comrade Dowbrett, Aberdeen, raises the question of immediate demands as a means of rousing the masses to action and asks space to put his point of view. He writes:—

What is the real purpose behind the formulation, by Socialists, of demands which obviously will not realise the Socialist Republic even if attained? There are two answers to this question, one reformist, and the other revolutionary. For the reformist, the attainment of the demand itself is the great object in view, for he believes that by the gradual attainment of many such demands, due to the gradual election of a majority of "gradualists" to that spiritual home of all graduality, the House of Commons, the workers will gradually

evolve into unexploited citizens of a Co-operative Commonwealth, while the exploiters (who, of course, would never resist the law!) will gradually evolve into public spirited directors of the communal affairs—worth at least £10,000 a year apiece.

The reformist, therefore, puts forward his demand in the name of the "community," imposes its acceptance by the bourgeoisie, and frowns upon, or even aids in suppressing any signs of militancy on the part of the proletariat, since such militancy would only render the hoped-for conversion of the bourgeoisie more difficult, if not impossible.

Unfortunately, this theory overlooks a few rather important points. It overlooks the inherently competitive and catastrophic nature of the capitalist economy, which, with its unavoidable panics, and wars, destroys the effects of such reforms as soon as they are attained. It overlooks the resultant individualistic and autocratic ideology of the bourgeoisie, which makes them quite impervious even to Mr. Snowden's "Socialist" arguments. It ignores—or deplures—the inevitable growth of militant mass action among the workers, whose simplest act of self defence smashes the "communal" illusion to atoms. In short, the reformist theory overlooks the part of the class struggle and its influence on history, and is a theory fit only for good-natured fools and ill-natured frauds.

Very different, however, is the revolutionist's attitude toward immediate demands. While the actual attainment of the demand is important, in that it strengthens the workers' position, and gives them confidence and courage, its chief importance lies in the fact that it brings forward wide masses of the backward workers who, through ignorance and apathy, are by no means prepared to fight for Communism, but are quite prepared, if properly agitated and led, to fight for bread. Such partial struggles gives this section of the workers organisation, experience and discipline, which can only be gained in action. At the same time it reveals to them the class character of the State, impresses them with a sense of their power, and leads them to demand more power. In short, prepares their minds for the propaganda of Communism.

"The main thing," Engels once rather brusquely told the inmates of a certain Socialist monastery, "is to

get the workers into action as a class. That once accomplished, they cannot go very far wrong."

It follows from the above that our immediate demands must often have the appearance of modesty in order to have the virtue of effectiveness. People simply *will not* fight for something they do not believe to be attainable. At the moment of struggle, what is, or is not actually attainable is not the question. *It is what the masses believe to be attainable that counts.*

If a demand for a scale or unemployed relief a little less in excess of the average wage would bring into action a larger number of people, than that now being demanded by the N.U.W.C.M. (and it undoubtedly would) such a demand would be far more revolutionary in effect. The average unemployed man will consider the demand for £3 a week for himself and wife and 18/- for two children as being Utopian and absurd. He would probably be ashamed to take it, and will certainly be ashamed to demand it. The average employed man will consider such a demand as an injustice to himself, and will certainly oppose it. It will be understood that I am speaking of the average worker, not just the average Red. It is admitted that the workers should not reason so, but it is insisted that they do.

It goes without saying that our "modesty" in this respect is not to be admired for its own sake. *Our demands must always be the very highest that will win the wholehearted support of a wide enough mass to make an effective mass movement, but no higher. To go beyond that point is to betray a greater interest in the immediate gain than the ultimate aim, and is, therefore, an unconscious concession to reformism,* although it lacks the "practicability" of the conscious reformist.

We must realise, too, that the reformist and the revolutionist have very different notions as to what constitutes practicability. For the reformist, the practicability of a demand consists in the willingness of the bourgeoisie to accept it. For the revolutionist, the practicability of a demand consists in the willingness of the proletariat to fight for it. The resistance of the bourgeoisie is expected, and is regarded as a necessary condition for the further organisation, and development of the struggle for power.

RECRUITS WANTED NOW



If you were warned that thugs were
waiting for you—

*You would get prepared for them,
wouldn't you ?*

The Experts' Plan is a Thieves' Compact.

Ⓒ It means for you :

Longer Hours

Reduced Wages

More Unemployment

MORE WARS

Be Prepared ! Get active now !

Ⓒ Join the ranks of the Communists !

DON'T WAIT !

SEND NOW FOR APPLICATION FORM TO
16 KING ST., COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.2

or fill up the form on page 250.

YOU must be well-informed !

ALL these Journals are essential if you are to keep in touch with advanced thought in this country.



**Q The
PLEBS**

4d. Monthly. The Brightest Journal of Working Class Education in the Country

**Q The
WORKER**

1d. Weekly. The most Important Industrial paper in Britain

**Q ALL
POWER**

1d. Monthly. The Monthly Journal of the Red International of Labour Unions

**Q The
YOUNG WORKER**

1d. Monthly. For Youthful Rebels. Give it to your Youngsters.



The above and all other revolutionary literature are obtainable from
The Communist Bookshop, 16 King-street, Covent Garden, W.C.2

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

*Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist
International*

P R I C E S I X P E N C E

By post : Six months, 3s. 6d.
twelve months, 7s.

J The English Edition is published by the Communist Party of Great Britain on the 15th of each month and contains special articles on the problems of the workers' movement in Germany, Britain, Austria, America, Japan, Italy, etc.

J Indispensable to every student of international politics and their bearing upon the workers' struggle.

Q Obtainable in England from
THE COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP
16 King-street, Covent Garden,
London, W.C.2