

IF YOU MUST BE WELL-INFORMED

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

The P L E B S

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

The Worker

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

All Power

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

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 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 4

APRIL 1924

Number 12

C O N T E N T S

The Editorial View	- - - - -	507
The Labour Government or the Class Struggle		
<i>C. M. Roebuck and R. Palme Dutt</i>		511
The Unemployed Workers' Charter: An Examination		
<i>E. Stanley</i>		520
The "New Trend" of the Bolshevik Party	- - -	526
Mayakovsky: Poet of the Russian Revolution		
<i>Henri Guilbeaux</i>		534
The Party Conference	<i>T. A. Jackson</i> - - - -	537
International Review	- - - - -	542
The Forum	- - - - -	543
Book Reviews	- - - - -	544

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. 6d. One year 6s. 9d. 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

THE capitalist class of this country is universally regarded as the most cunning and subtle of all the sections of the international bourgeoisie. Its cunning and subtlety, of course, comes from the longer and wider experience it has had over its world competitors, an experience and training which has carried it through many crises. In international politics, to take an example, it has never failed to bring its highly-trained commercial mind to bear upon the problems, however elementary, that have baffled from time to time the less skilled statesmen of the many young "independent" nationalities thrown up by the war. In this way Great Britain has come to be reckoned as a kind of benefactor to Europe, and the world generally.

Pretentiousness and cant, associated with this purely commercial spirit of compromise is, of course, concealed as long as the illusion of patrimony is maintained. But let there arise any real challenge to British industrial supremacy or political sovereignty, whether from world competitors as *e.g.*, Germany, or from insurgent movements in the colonies, *e.g.*, South Africa or India, and militarism as rampant and efficient as Prussianism ever was, becomes the order of the day.

We are prompted to preface our Notes this month with these remarks for two very good reasons: first, because it is now becoming much clearer from the statements made by responsible capitalist politicians why our precarious Labour Government was allowed by the capitalist parties to assume the reins of office, —an action of the capitalist parties quite in keeping with its traditional policy of compromise; and secondly, because we are concerned with the disillusionment rapidly coming over large masses of workers regarding the value of parliamentary democracy as an instrument of the class struggle.

It is true the Government has only been some eight weeks or so in office. But it has been long enough there to show, by its record, where it stands on the important issues before the working class. And, if the disillusionment is not to lead to disorganisation in the ranks, the workers must at least be roused to the realities of the situation, and be prepared for parliamentary defeat when it comes.

* * * * *

When MacDonald decided to accept the King's invitation to form a Government, there was much rejoicing in the camp of the Second International, *i.e.*, of the Socialist opportunists. The British workers were at last in power. We were now going to get a real demonstration of the value of the "evolutionary" way to Socialism by the practical commonsense-minded British workers. In short, the British Labour Party would prove to the workers the merit of progressive reformism over revolutionary dictatorship! Such was the mentality of the Socialist opportunists everywhere. True, many workers also took the fact of a Labour Government to mean that the working class was in power, but these formed only the most backward section of the workers—a notable alignment for the Second Internationalists.

But the Communist Party, from the first was under no delusion. We had witnessed a couple of years of ferocious industrial warfare involving the impoverishment of millions of the workers by means of wage cuts and unemployment, and also the bankruptcy of formerly powerful trade unions. We had watched for a long time the development of the petit-bourgeois illusions of pacifism and reformism engendered by the imperialist war. We had seen these illusions accentuated by the struggles of capitalism to stabilise itself, and reflecting themselves in a growth of the political influence of the Labour Party. What was the bourgeoisie to do? Were they to allow that growth to proceed unchecked? To do so would be folly indeed for capitalism, especially when in addition to the handicap of these circumstances, the complete failure to secure international peace and political stability was becoming an absorbing factor in domestic politics. It was at this stage that the unerring instinct of the British bourgeoisie for compromising came to the rescue; hence the experiment of a Labour Government.

* * * * *

In case it be thought we are indulging in mere speculation or cynicism, let the Tory ex-Prime Minister and employer Baldwin speak for his class. Addressing the City Carlton Club

(19/3/24) on the relations of the three Parties, Baldwin declared that :—

“The Labour Party have, hitherto had a great advantage over us in that they can present ideals which have never been put to the touchstone of fact. But now that they are in office they have either to talk less on the platform or put those ideals into practice.”

And, he went on to say :—

“When the election came, not only would the style of the Labour leaders be subjected to an unusual cramp, begotten of experience, but there would be less confidence in the rank and file in the reception of the nostrums that would be put forward.”

Baldwin's meaning here is quite plain. “Since you cannot produce rabbits out of tall hats,” to quote Tom Shaw, the longer the Labour Government remains in office lessons of this kind will be learned by the workers, and the political stock of the Labour Party go down at the next general election.

Certainly, if we are to judge from the show made by the Government on the debates on the Cruisers, the Air Force, and the Army Estimates, its stock will indeed be low. For one thing, the majority of the workers who voted Labour at the last election did expect some measure of security against war, in addition to the passing of urgent reform measures to deal with unemployment and housing. It will tax the ingenuity of Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues to explain away the increase in armaments, while having nothing more concrete to point to in the shape of social reforms, than incidentals like that of the “Gap” and promises of mother's pensions.

Nevertheless, in spite of the complete exposure of the reformist policy of “one step at a time,” we are satisfied that the experiment of the Labour Party as the government of the country has its advantages for the progress of our working class movement. For one thing, Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues now know, as the Labour movement in the whole is learning, that the Labour Party is definitely unlike either the Tory or the Liberal Party. It is unlike these parties in the sense that it cannot separate itself from its membership and adherents once in office.

* * * * *

Since our issue last month, the Government has suffered its first defeat. That defeat for the Communist Party has a valuable lesson. It proves to the hilt our insistence, that besides the will of the Liberal and Tory parties, there is yet another factor entering into the life of the Labour Government. *That factor is the industrial power of the organised Labour unions.* When the miners refused to yield up their claim to be heard, we can imagine the consternation of the Labour Whips. For our

part we think the miners showed sound instinct. The class struggle is not a mere question of parliamentary combination. Parliament is a platform for the mobilisation of the masses upon the war against capitalism. To subordinate the economic demands of an oppressed section of the working class like the miners for the smooth conduct of capitalist State business would indeed have been a tragic surrender to parliamentarism. The miners did right even in jeopardising the position of the Government. And from what we can gather a similar fate awaits the Government at the hands of the Builders' Union if MacDonald is not careful, for, as everyone knows, the success of the Government's Housing policy is dependent upon the goodwill of the Building workers.

The struggle of the miners, the builders, the engineers, and the other sections of the Trade Union movement, is thus driving home the importance of the Communist Party's argument, viz. : that the political movement of the workers must look to the Labour organisations in the country for its strength and not upon the groups of capitalism whose sole concern is the setting back and defeat of our proletarian movement.

A sagacious Labour Government would be wise in refusing to allow the fact of its dependence upon Liberal and Tory votes to maintain its existence in office to overshadow the bigger fact, that if it entertains any hopes of being returned as a majority Party, it is to that extent dependent upon Trade Union and Industrial votes. The leaders of the Trade Union movement are gradually appreciating this fact, and the Labour Party would be wise indeed in its councils, if it saw to it that when the time comes, and a fresh appeal has to be made to the country, that it confronts the workers with a record of real striving and endeavour on their behalf throughout the present negotiations which are taking place. Just as surely as that the next Labour Party Conference will have to examine very carefully the whole question of Party control of the Government, so also, in return, will the Labour Party have to make it clear to the Trade Union movement that when the Party is in the Government of the country its function is not that of mediator or negotiator between the employers and the unions, but that the Party, even as a Government is the leader of the workers' struggle and must legislate accordingly. The extent to which the present experiment tends to compel the consideration of these two very important features by the whole movement, to that extent alone the present experiment will make possible great progress.

The Labour Government or the Class Struggle

A RECENT article by Comrade R. P. Dutt in the "Workers' Weekly," (February 8th), deals with the position created by the advent of the Labour Government so inadequately, that it is worth while going over the ground again. Comrade Dutt's Thesis is that the Labour Government represents "the beginning of the awakening of the British working class," but it exists by the will of the bourgeoisie, and itself contains a number of "bourgeois elements," against whom we must fight. True, Comrade Dutt changes his phrases in a confusing manner. At one point, he speaks definitely of these "bourgeois elements," meaning individual bourgeois members: later, he says "bourgeois forces," which may or may not include MacDonald and his friends, whom Comrade Dutt calls "followers of the Liberal tradition"; later, he speaks of conducting a fight against bourgeois "policy," which means something quite different from "elements"—although later still he again returns to the "bourgeois forces in the Government," and its "open association with the bourgeoisie."

If this is clear in Comrade Dutt's mind, it does not make for clearness in the reader's. It is doubtful, however, whether Comrade Dutt himself had a clear idea throughout of how he was tackling the question of the Labour Government. For at one point he says that they are Liberals, denying class issues in politics which "inevitably brings them into opposition to the working class." This would lead to the conclusion that the more speedily and effectively their true character is unmasked, by forcing upon them the class demands of the workers, the better. Yet, in his last paragraph, Comrade Dutt tells us that what the workers require is a class Government, but "the greatest *danger* in the way of that is the discrediting of a Labour Government by its open association with the bourgeoisie and impotence to help the workers." At present, he says, such discrediting would mean "indifference and apathy for a period. So that we should *not* expose the open association, etc., and should only carry on the fight against the bourgeois elements in the Cabinet: that is the conclusion we come to, and it is entirely in contradiction to the previous one (apart from being in contradiction to revolutionary Leninism)!

How it is that Comrade Dutt comes to lead us to this extraordinary conclusion? We find the key in his explanation that the discrediting is undesirable "in the present stage of slowly-awakening class-consciousness"—recalling a previous phrase, when dealing with the composition of the Cabinet, that "the mistake has been the passivity of the working-class movement as a whole." He says that "the next stage is not yet ready: the forces to succeed are not yet conscious and organised . . . Only in proportion as strong new forces arise ready to succeed to the present can we challenge the present type of Government." Comrade Dutt merely states this as a fact, and leaves it at that: just as at the beginning of the article he asserts that the election of 192 Labour M.P.'s in December, 1923, meant that the workers "were acting *for the first time*, however dimly, as a class force in politics!"

"How?" "Why?" and "When?" are words that would not seem to enter into his vocabulary. Instead of enquiring how the movement is to be made *active*, how the awakening of class consciousness is to be *quickened*, how the proletarian forces are to *become* conscious and organised, *where* the strong new forces are to come from, he turns aside to the less difficult problem of how to agitate against the bourgeois ministers without overturning, or discrediting the Government. Yet the hopelessness of this very task should make us realise that this is *not* "the immediate task before the active elements in the working class movement," and that those "elements" (need we be so shy of calling them Communists?) must occupy themselves less with the Labour Government and more with the class struggle.

THE POLITICAL ADVANCE OF WORKERS.

For what is the situation when we come to look into Comrade Dutt's scheme more closely? The workers are "passive," "not yet conscious and organised." Why? Because, as everyone knows, in the years 1921 and 1922, partly in 1923, they suffered unheard-of defeats, and went through unprecedented betrayals on the part of their leaders. If an election had been held in the spring of 1922, does anyone believe that 140 Labour members would have been returned? No one who remembers the state of despair and discouragement which prevailed can do so—except persons who live only in a world of illusion, whose mind works in watertight compartments, and who can think of "the political movement" winning victories where "the industrial movement" has even lost the heart to fight. (Particularly in Great Britain, where the unions are the basis of the political Labour Party). In a word, no Marxists.

Why were 140 members returned, amidst unprecedented enthusiasm, in November, 1922 (already we are carried a year back beyond Comrade Dutt's "beginning of the awakening")? Because for several months already the industrial movement had begun to show signs of revival (the autumn campaign of the R.I.L.U., the turning of the tide of decrease of union membership, etc.). What was this due to? The revival in trade, which began after July, 1922, small but unmistakable, as all figures of production, commerce, prices, unemployment, etc. show, and itself due to the preceding defeats of the workers. The dialectic of history—the defeat of the workers helping the capitalist system to revive (I leave out the international situation, which was reproducing the same conditions on a larger scale); the revival of the capitalist system producing a new revival of the working-class movement; and this in its turn dragging down the capitalist system once more—this is the picture which we see in the second half of 1922, and developing still more widely in 1923 (notwithstanding a temporary improvement in 1923, caused by the increase of trade in coal, iron, steel, and the other heavy industries, due in its turn to the French occupation and disorganisation of the Ruhr). A picture for which we are prepared when we start, *not with the General Election*, but with the method of historical and economic analysis which Marx and Lenin taught us. But, of course, we are less interested in pictures than in the lessons they convey.

The spring of 1923 saw the first big mass action since 1920—first local (agricultural labourers, jute, vehicle workers) and then national (dockers, co-operative employees). In spite of all the leaders' treachery or cowardice, or muddleheadedness, the masses showed a new spirit of fight, even of aggression. And it is in the light of these events, as their reflection, that we have to regard the political advance (from 142 to 192, and the "snap" formation of a Labour Government) at the end of the year. The capitalist side of the picture shows us the same; the failure to produce a real trade revival (I refer the reader to an article in No. 30 of the "Communist International" for a more detailed analysis); the consequent discord between the big manufacturers (particularly the heavy industries) and the financiers and landowners: the disillusionment of the middle classes and the transference of their allegiance from the Conservative to the Liberal Party: the Government's efforts to patch up the breach, in a successive appeal to the expedients of inflation, export credits, public works, and the Imperial Conference: and the last despairing throw of the Election.

From beginning to end we see the inexorable pressure of economic events, on the one hand driving the masses together again, raising them up on a long-lost plane of courage and determination, bringing them out into open combat even in spite of their generals: and on the other hand defeating the policy of the ruling bourgeois bloc—that coalition of its most resolute manufacturers, landowners and bankers which undertook the great counter-attack in 1921—causing dissensions and defection in its ranks, producing corresponding profound social re-grouping in the ranks of the ever-wavering middle classes, and petty bourgeoisie; and both sides of this vast process finding expression at the moment of the General Election, itself forced by the hopeless position of the ruling group. It is with this background in our minds, and this only, that we have the right to approach the problem of the Labour Government and the next tasks of the revolutionary workers. And when we have this process clear as the background, we are led to very different conclusions from those of Comrade Dutt.

THE PRESENT SITUATION ANALYSED.

It is an old saying in the Russian Bolshevik Party that the first item at any of their Party meetings or conferences, legal or illegal, has always been "the present moment"—a brief analysis of the economic and political situation and the relations of classes at the moment. This was a necessary preliminary to any practical discussion of revolutionary tasks and it was Lenin's lesson. Nevertheless, it was correct not merely because it was a Bolshevik or Leninist practice, but because it was a Marxian practice, true to the scientific method Marx taught the working class, of basing all its action on an objective appreciation of realities. If Comrade Dutt had started with such an analysis, however brief, instead of fixing his era at the General Election, and depicting the class-struggle with that as background, he would not have run the risk of misleading his readers into the belief that the mobilisation of the workers for pressure on the Labour Government is the main task of the revolutionary Marxists.

What does our preceding short analysis reveal? It reveals that

First, the great bourgeoisie have suffered defeat on the political field, following economic defeat (one should strictly say "temporary economic defeat," of course). Second, the middle classes and lower middle classes have been disillusioned in Conservative promises of tranquility and better trade, and

terrified at the prospect of Protection, and have temporarily reformed that solid bloc of pre-war days which constitutes the backbone of the Liberal Party. Third, the working class has recovered much energy and resolution, compared with the apathy and disorganisation of two years ago, but very far from completely. This, it will be remembered, is the state of things which Comrade Dutt merely *registers*, without explaining. This is due partly to the unstable nature of the economic situation—now improving, now deteriorating—but most of all to the absence of any determined and clearheaded leadership. It has succeeded in gaining the adherence of a large section of the hardest-hit lower middle classes, but at too great a price—the watering down by its leaders of its class programme.

Fourth, the economic state of unstable equilibrium has produced a corresponding state of political unstable equilibrium in which the temporarily strengthened middle class holds the balance of power, and which can pass into a condition of open class struggle again, only as either the great bourgeoisie, or the working class passes to the great attack. To postpone that moment as far as in it lies, the middle bourgeois bloc has yielded political power to the worker-and-lower-middle-class-bloc.

TESTING THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT.

How long will this position last? The Labour Government cannot pacify dissolving and revolutionary Europe; but every step it takes towards this object which helps to improve British trade, only produces a more and more aggressive spirit in the working class. The watchword of "internal peace" will tend to fade more and more into the background, and the Labour Government will be forced closer and closer to the point at which it must decide on becoming, either a government of the working class, or a government of the bourgeoisie, ready to assist the desperate capitalist class in an effort to break down the workers' attack, as in 1920-1921. If it adopts the first alternative, and decides to throw in its cause with the workers, it will have to go outside Parliament—for a purely Parliamentary government would have to face the immediate alienation of the Liberals. If it takes the second alternative, it must drift into the arms of the Liberals, who will then dispense with MacDonald just as pitilessly as the Conservatives dispensed with Lloyd George. In either case the workers will have lost many illusions: and the duty of the workers' friends is

to hasten the day of the disappearance of those illusions, by both exposing the weakness of the Labour Government in which the workers put their trust, and by directing the workers' attention to the real battlefield. For in either case it is the activity of the masses, not merely in support of what Comrade Dutt calls "the battle of the Labour Government," but in attacks upon the capitalist system, wherever and whenever, they can hit it, that will definitely bring that system crashing to ruin, unfold the class struggle along the whole vast front, and *incidentally* test the fitness of the present Labour Government to be described and maintained as "a Government based on the working class against its enemies."

This is the crux of the problem. The working masses are much more active than they were two years ago, but much less active than they should be if they are to attain class victory. Any revolutionary development in Europe, any strike in Britain itself which, like a railway or dock strike, draws wider and wider masses into its orbit almost of its own momentum—such factors must, of course, hasten the revolutionary education of the masses. But we cannot *rely* upon such factors: they are not certain within our lifetime; as Comrade Dutt says "we cannot look on with folded arms." Only this stern phrase must be followed with an equally stern deduction. It is not a question of popularising a programme for a Workers' Government alone, but of a much wider task: of the proletariat becoming reaccustomed to free mass action, to mass demonstrations, to coming out into the streets in masses.

To prepare themselves for the fight against capitalism, the workers have to clear their heads of the poisonous fumes of the "social peace" doctrine, preached into them for four generations; they have to lose their fetishism of, and concentration upon, the sham of Parliament; and they must lose what remains of their respect (they have lost a great deal since 1914) for bourgeois legality. How can they achieve this? Only by constant practice and experience; by the experience of sectional and national strikes for economic ends: by the practice of imposing demonstrations, in which they realise their collective might, on topics near to their hearts (the housing question, unemployment, defence of the Russian or German workers, abolition of the House of Lords (or the Monarchy) if these interfere with the fullest utilisation of the democratic machine on behalf of the workers, etc.), and, of course, as occasion arises, on the demands which Dutt recounts, and many more which naturally enter into the programme of a

workers' government (only more positive and concrete : nationalisation of mines, railways, shipping and the land, rationing of housing space, joint initiative with Russia in summoning an international disarmament conference, etc.).

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE CHARTISTS.

In short, if the workers are to be fitted for seizing the reality and not the shadow of power, and for overcoming the resistance of the capitalist class in any shape or form, they must learn again the great lessons of the '30's and '40's in the days when the Chartists led the still unorganised and insufficiently class-conscious working class almost to the brink of power. And this time there can be no such mistake, no such confusion or misplaced confidence, as in 1831-2 : the working class must have clearly in its mind the self-confidence and determination of an independent class fighting for power, and enjoy single, but omnipresent leadership. That self-confidence it can only acquire in the daily practice of the actual struggle ; and the task of the revolutionary workers, of the Communist Party which alone can supply the programme and leadership, is to follow in the footsteps of the Chartists, and be at hand every day to help the workers to gain practical experience, and to understand the lessons it teaches.

What then are the immediate tasks of the Party—not only of the “ active elements in the working class movement,” as Comrade Dutt coyly puts it ?

1. To spare no effort in educating the workers by partial struggles, leading them into the streets as an organised mass as often as possible.

(a) Working out fighting programmes for each industry.

(b) Establishing real contact between the Party and the R.I.L.U.

(c) In all strikes placing the maximum Party resources (human and technical) at the disposal of the workers (including a page of the “ Worker's Weekly ”).

(d) Extreme care, in criticism of leaders, to see that it is *positive* and not merely abuse.

(e) Maximum utilisation of all opportunities for demonstrations, (as above, and for the capital levy, against colonial exploitation, petitions “ at the bar of the House,” etc.).

2. To explain to the workers as clearly as possible the duties of a Labour Government.

(a) Working out a real programme of action.

(b) Presenting this programme to the Trades Councils Conference and Trade Union Congress.

(c) Exerting pressure on the Government to accept this programme or the appropriate sectional demands, through individual trades councils or union branches.

(d) Demanding regular reporting of Ministers and M.P.'s before the trades councils, working class meetings, etc.

3. To strike root at last in the masses, in such a way as to ensure that no capitalist or Government efforts can dislodge us.

(a) The fighting watchword “ the workshop group instead of the area group, as the *basis* of local Party organisation,” (not mechanical re-grouping of the present membership, but building up workshop groups

around Party members now in factories, by recruiting amongst workshop sympathisers).

(b) Adaptation of Party literature to this end, and first of all the paper (letters from factories at all costs). Concentration of Party activity on this end (canvassing of factory readers of the "Workers' Weekly," meetings at workshop gates, penetration through the unions, etc.).

(c) As a preliminary step, explaining to trades councils the importance of having in their midst representatives of factories, not only of union branches, particularly in the coming period of industrial struggle, and involving the whole working population of many districts.

This work is particularly important, because only its successful fulfilment constitutes a guarantee that we shall be able to tackle other problems: winning the unions, keeping the Party in touch with the workers, making the masses feel that the "Workers' Weekly" is *their* paper, ensuring the latter a large circulation without absorbing all the energies of Party members in house-to-house canvassing, rendering possible illegal work, if we are ever attacked as the German, Italian and American parties have been, etc. It is not a question of ceasing all our other activities: but of selecting those *fundamental* tasks of policy and organisation which are dictated by an analysis of the present situation, and making up our mind that we shall fulfil them. Only in this way shall we be able to deal, not only with such problems as that of the present Labour Government, but with all the changing situations and unexpected difficulties which the workers will meet in the class war.

C. M. ROEBUCK.

Palme Dutt's Reply

Comrade Roebuck's article is much too good to quarrel over, even though he has peppered it with my name every few lines in order to belabour me. I think there is not so much difference between us as he thinks, except the difference between an article of 1,400 words in a weekly for very simple readers and an article of 4,500 words in a theoretical review. If Comrade Roebuck had continually to write many short articles rapidly, he would find it not possible always to begin with a "historical and economic analysis" of preceeding history, "production, commerce, prices, unemployment, etc." and necessary to refer in a simple shorthand manner to the fact that the Labour Government "reflects the beginning of the awakening of the British working class," without going into the history of the period from the end of 1922 covered by that phrase.

The elaboration of the methods of intensifying the class struggle is good, but there is nothing in it opposed to anything

I have written. If Comrade Roebuck believes that all I consider necessary is "the mobilisation of the workers for pressure on the Labour Government," I can only refer him to any issue of the *Workers' Weekly* for the contrary. Practically every point that Comrade Roebuck writes on theoretically in his article we are endeavouring to carry out in practice through the *Workers' Weekly*. Once again the limitations of a special article limited the treatment to special questions of the relation to a Labour Government.

The only difference of any importance in principle is the question of marking out "bourgeois forces" (*i.e.*, concrete acts of "bourgeois policy" and "individual bourgeois ministers") in the Labour Government for special attack, rather than simply treating the Labour Government as a whole. The reason for adopting this as a Party policy (and in this the article was only reflecting the policy of the Party), is because we do believe that there is a danger of mere apathy and indifference following the discrediting of the Labour Government in general, unless that discrediting takes the form of a vigorous division between Left and Right; and that we obviously do not challenge the Labour Government as such until we have that strength of the working class forces that is ready to set up or endeavour to set up an alternative Government.

There are one or two practical points in the last part of the article which reflect Comrade Roebuck's non-participation in local work, and are not quite accurate, but these need not be gone into here. The importance of the article is its presentation of the systematic pushing forward of the class struggle as the positive policy in relation to the Labour Government, and its warning against the danger of thinking of the questions of the Labour Government as a compartment by itself.

R. PALME DUTT.



The Unemployed Workers' Charter : An Examination

THE Unemployed Workers' Charter, prepared and issued by the Unemployment Joint Advisory Council of the Trade Union Congress General Council, and the National Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement, marks the first official step towards contact between employed and unemployed workers. Real working class contact has been furnished in the past by the unemployed, who have actively assisted their employed brothers in the struggle against the employing class. After years of active participation in the workers' struggle, the organised unemployed, it appears, are to receive mild recognition at the hands of official labour of the Trade Union world.

The organised unemployed have made mistakes; false leads may have been thrown up in the struggle, yet the greater mistake was made by the Labour movement, when it forced the unemployed out of sheer necessity to organise in a separate organisation. This mistake was aggravated by a persistent refusal to give official recognition to the active unemployed; often unemployed assistance given to the striking, or locked out workers was repudiated by official Labour.

When the employed have left the Trade Unions in thousands; when the unemployed have been fairly well quietened by the wily methods of the ruling class, the policy of the advanced workers comes to the fore, and, as an experiment of a mild character the "Charter" is thrust into the arena.

CONDITIONS SURROUNDING THE CHARTER.

It is well these facts should be understood. The unemployed have, to a degree, adapted themselves to unemployment with all its misery, and worse still, with the spirit of revolt, either crushed or deadened in the struggle. On the other hand, the employed, who can fend for themselves, have adapted themselves to the circumstances of a huge unemployed army, regarding the same as a natural phase in the system.

Under these circumstances, it is surely a bit belated to seek to obtain that necessary contact of the workers.

Yet, as the advanced workers realise, the assistance of the unemployed to the Labour movement can no longer be ignored; they are an important asset. In the N.U.W.C.M. itself, conditions have driven out the various One Big Union factions, etc., and have determined a policy of closer contact with the employed workers. The lesson is obvious. Both movements to survive must act unitedly against the employing class.

Further, the Charter is issued at the time when the reins of government is assumed by the Labour Party, and when the workers are showing their temper against the capitalist offensive, in the form of unorganised, spasmodic strikes, in which the unemployed always play a leading part, a feature that gives promise for the future.

It is desirable that these facts should be borne in mind when reviewing the Charter.

BRITISH CITIZENS.

The first lines on the Charter announce that it is submitted "to the judgment of British *Citizens*."* One does not quarrel over terms usually, yet in a Workers' Charter, "Citizen" breathes too much of that democracy so beloved by the constitutionalists, who always pretend to abhor class terms. Why should it later be styled 'the Unemployed Workers' Charter,' yet submitted to the judgment of "British *Citizens*?" Why not submit it to the "British *Workers*?"

We must note one important proof of capitalist decline: important and of a serious character to capitalism, yet accepted with calmness by all workers to-day. This reads "the tragic consequences of *prolonged* unemployed."

Then "the Charter represents a programme for immediate attainment by united action."

It is true that as a step toward the fuller demands of the unemployed, united action will immediately attain this programme.

It all resolves into a question of exactly what united action means. United action to us, is activity similar in character to that of the unemployed, who have demonstrated on the streets their solidarity with the employed. United action means that, as the workers strike for higher wages, etc., so shall they strike in support of "The Unemployed Workers' Charter."

The unemployed cannot adopt the strike weapon, yet they refuse to scab upon workers who do. The moral is clear. *The workers who refuse to adopt the general strike in support of the Charter are guilty of scabbing upon the unemployed.*

* *Italics mine,*

Such a strike would do much to force through the immediate attainment of the Six Point Charter, and bring into the struggle the Labour Government, from whom support would be expected in addition to the backing from the N.U.W.C.M., the organised workers and the Trade Union Congress General Council. A Labour Government refusing to support the struggling workers would be exposed as defenders of capitalism, like their predecessors.

THE SIX POINTS EXAMINED.

The six points in the Charter are prefaced by the class terms. "We Demand." To demand savours of force. The unemployed have learned that organised force is the only weapon to gain anything from the ruling class.

Let us examine briefly the six points contained in the Charter.

(1) *Work or effective maintenance** for all unemployed workers, and increased Government assistance to be provided through trade unions. All unemployment relief to be completely dissociated from Poor Law administration.

"Effective Maintenance" is an evasion of a definite statement. Adequate maintenance was a statement juggled with, by the Ministry of Labour and local Poor Law bodies to the detriment of the unemployed. "Effective" is a similar evasive term. We would prefer the position of the N.U.W.C.M. objective, which states, ". . . shall be work at trade union rates or maintenance at trade union rates where said rates of wages are not less than the National Demands from the Guardians . . ." The N.U.W.C.M. are more definite in their demands toward this object, stating the exact demand to be obtained from the Guardians (See N.U.W.C.M. Red Card).

A Worker's Charter must be definite, clear in its terms and be of a class character. "Effective Maintenance" when applied to this test can be interpreted in many ways unsatisfactorily.

"Increased Government assistance" would certainly bring into prominence again some sort of a Capital Levy to the obvious discomfiture of the Labour Government.

With the rest of Point One we are in entire agreement.

GOVERNMENT SCHEMES.

(2) The immediate development of *Government schemes** of employment to absorb the unemployed in their own trades at trade union rate of wages and conditions.

In this Point no definite Government schemes are stated.

* Italics mine.

We are well aware of the immediate necessity for a Government Housing scheme, yet even a Labour Government might put in hand the building of more cruisers, aeroplanes and other means of destruction, in preference to schemes of a character beneficial to the workers.

Governmental schemes to provide useful commodities, etc. for the workers, paid for at trade union rates, would in all probability also bring forward the Capital Levy and the forces of capitalist reaction

A Workers' Charter should recognise that any attempt to touch private property or capitalist interests, will be challenged by the whole force of capitalism. Point Two is vague in this sense, no methods being formulated to attain the desired objective.

STATE WORKSHOPS.

(3) The establishment of *State workshops* for the purpose of *supplying* the necessary service or commodities to meet the *requirements of Government Departments.**

It is not stated what type of service or commodity these State workshops should supply to Government Departments. Service or commodities supplied to Government Departments can mean anything to injure, or assist the workers. It should be definitely stated that these workshops are to supply the requirements of Government Departments, only on condition that these Departments are engaged upon work for the workers' welfare.

Here again, a Labour Government would be tested by the support it gave to the Workers' Charter.

REDUCED HOURS OF LABOUR.

(4) The reduction in the hours of labour necessary to absorb unemployed workers, the normal working day or week to be regulated by the requirements of the industry.

With this point we are in entire agreement, though we refuse to place the same importance upon the Six-hour day, say, as do some workers. There are more important issues before the workers than this, *i.e.*, issues which are more likely to receive the full support of the workers. It is of relative importance, but necessary at the moment to protect even the Eight-hour day that is in danger of being abolished or increased.

UNEMPLOYED TRAINING CENTRES.

(5) The establishment of occupational training centres for unemployed workers, providing proper training with effective maintenance, particularly for unemployed boys and girls and able-bodied *ex-service* men.*

* *Italics mine.*

We are in entire agreement with the establishment of centres for training the unemployed, especially the unemployed youth. To operate this Point in a working class fashion, would be of extreme value to the workers' movement. Yet we are suspicious that it is a mere statement with no definite objective in view.

Why a Workers' Charter should make special mention of ex-service men is a paradox. Surely the workers' movement knows no distinction between an ex-service man and a worker.

The evasive "effective maintenance" again creeps into this Point, to confuse the issue.

(6) The provision of suitable housing accommodation at rents within the means of wage-earners, and the proper use of existing houses.

This Point will provide the means for portions of the other Points to be operated. The Labour Government will need to be firm in the matter, and happily in regard to the rationing of existing houses, have an example provided by Soviet Russia.

A MILD CHARTER.

A more detailed lengthy examination of the Charter would only prove its inefficiency. Sufficient has been written to show that it lacks a working class consciousness: it is most vague and indefinite in its demands. Its mildness is accentuated by the fact that it is issued at a time when a Labour Government is in office, and the workers are rallying to an offensive against the Boss Class.

Surely a Workers' Charter at this period should act as a clarifying lead to the workers awaking from their stupor. In contradistinction this Charter offers little for the workers to rally to; it lacks the sterling class outlook and spirit. With any form of Government approaching a real Workers' Government, such a Charter would be considered reactionary.

Furthermore, placed side by side with the demands of the N.U.W.C.M., it becomes a simple electoral manifesto issued by Labour (and sometimes Liberal) to catch votes. Had this Charter (with more of a workers' taste about it) been issued at the beginning of the year 1921, it would have acted as a splendid lead and rallied the mass to a united attack, but to-day . . .

We are eagerly looking forward to the six explanatory leaflets to be issued to see if the aforementioned faults have in any way been removed.

THE DUTY OF THE RANK AND FILE.

In any case, realising the ineptitude of the present Labour

* Italics mine.

Government and the Labour movement to tackle unemployment in a thoroughgoing class manner, it becomes the duty of the advanced sections of the employed and unemployed to make the Charter into a *real* Workers' Charter. Despite its glaring faults, it marks a step towards united workers' contact: it is an admission of a grave mistake by the Labour movement, and recognition of the organised unemployed's place in the workers' movement.

Joint consideration by the two bodies mentioned, is being given to the question of the Trade Unions recognising as a clearance card, the Contribution Card of members of the N.U.W.C.M., who obtain employment and rejoin the Trade Union. This, if operated, will mark a further step towards contact.

THE POWER OF UNITED ACTION.

Working class contact is vitally necessary to bring united action. Its necessity no one questions. Its use would prevent the efforts of the employed being frittered away in unorganised sectarian strikes, which react upon all the workers.

The Labour Government will be tested by united action. If they fail the workers, it will be a lesson dearly learnt, yet a necessary one in the class struggle.

If the rank and file workers, employed and unemployed (given a lead by the advance guard of the workers' movement) are determined to tackle the question of contact and take the Charter off paper, keeping in mind its many faults and the surrounding circumstances, they can make it into and operate it as a real Workers' Charter.

E. STANLEY.



The "New Trend" of the Bolshevik Party

Resolution of the 13th Conference of the Party.

THE Thirteenth Conference of the Russian Communist Party, in its session of January 18th, adopted with only two dissentient votes, the following resolution: *Origin of the Discussion.*—Some time before any act of the opposition, since September, 1923, in fact, the plenary session of the Central Committee—and, earlier yet, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of our Party—had studied the necessity of intensifying the activity of the Party, and of strengthening working class democracy within it.

The progress of industry, which terminated the process of the decay of our proletariat, the elevation of the intellectual level of the working class, and the growth of its activities, have produced conditions more favourable for putting into practice the fundamental principles of democracy within the Party. Also, the economic conflicts of last summer—although they presented no danger, their extent being far less than previously—drew our attention to breaches in the relations of our organisation with the non-Party masses of the workers.

The Central Committee was convinced that a new orientation of the Party would only be possible after prudent and well-considered preparation. Conscious, therefore, of its duty, the Central Committee, in September, 1923, commenced its preparations to this end.

Certain small groups and circles of the old opposition, whose policies had many times been condemned by the Party, believed that the moment had come to engage in a general offensive against the Central Committee of the Party. In the hope that the question of democracy in the Party would specially attract the attention of its adherents, they decided to exploit this slogan in the interests of their own faction. After the decision of the plenary session of the C.C., last September, there appeared the letter of Comrade Trotsky, followed immediately by the letter written by forty-six comrades of the opposition. These documents contained an absolutely false analysis, inspired by the most exaggeratedly factional spirit, of the economic situation of the

country and the present condition of the Party. This produced a grave economic crisis in the Republic, and a no less serious crisis within the Party, at the same time bringing against the C.C. the accusation of having given the Party a false directive.

The gravest culpability of these factional acts of Comrade Trotsky and the comrades of the opposition arises from the fact that these documents became known in the large centres of the Party, having been distributed in the working class quarters, among the youth of the Moscow schools, and, immediately after, throughout the whole Soviet Union.

The joint plenary session of the C.C. and Central Control Commission, which took place last October, with the participation of the ten largest bodies within the Party, justly condemned the attitude of Comrade Trotsky and the 46 opposition comrades as having the character of a factional move. At the same time, the initiative taken by the Political Bureau, with the aim of giving more life to the internal activities of the Party, and of developing working class democracy, was unanimously approved. This plenary session also decided not to carry on the discussion, started by Comrade Trotsky and the 46 other comrades outside of the C.C., and not to publish either the letter of Comrade Trotsky and the 46, nor the reply of the Political Bureau and the joint resolution of the C.C. and the Control Commission, which, by 102 votes against 2, and 10 abstentions, had condemned the action of the "opposition."

Trotsky and his 46 partisans did not, however, submit to this authoritative order of the Party, and continued their methodical campaign against the C.C., first in the principal units of the Party in Moscow, and then in the whole Soviet Union.

The Political Bureau, conforming to the decisions of the Plenary Sessions, applied itself to carrying out the resolution on the internal situation of the Party and working class democracy.

In spite of the factional activities of Comrade Trotsky, the majority of the Political Bureau judged it necessary to arrive at an understanding with him. As a result of the prolonged efforts of the majority of the Political Bureau, the resolution of the Political Bureau, and of the Bureau of the Central Control Commission, on the development of activity within the Party, was unanimously adopted on December 5th, 1923.

At the time of the drawing-up of the text of the resolution of the Political Bureau and of the Bureau of the C.C.C., one of the questions most under discussion was that of fractions within the Party. Comrade Trotsky offered no objection to the pro-

hibition of fractions. He only insisted that liberty of grouping be admitted. Nevertheless, they were successful in finding a formula which was unanimously approved, and which, with regard to fractions, was derived from the decision of the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party.

The "opposition," however, continued its factional struggle. While the majority of the C.C. and of the C.C.C., bound by their correct decision not to publish documents of a polemical nature, strictly conformed to this decision, the "opposition" has not ceased to distribute documents appertaining to its factional campaign. Two days after the publication of the resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Political Bureau and the Presidium of the C.C.C., Comrade Trotsky published his well-known letter, entitled: "The New Trend," which constitutes, in fact, a factional manifesto against the Central Committee. Comrade Trotsky's articles, which followed at short intervals, as well as his pamphlet, published on the eve of the opening session of the Party Conference, rendered still more obvious how much factionalism there was in his actions.

After the appearance of Comrade Trotsky's factional manifesto, the discussion increased.

The "opposition" launched in Moscow, especially in the military sections of the Party, and in the high schools, a campaign, of a vehemence hitherto unknown in the history of our Party, against the C.C., endeavouring to weaken the confidence of our membership in the Party. Representatives of the "opposition" travelled the length and breadth of Russia. The conflict assumed a most acute character. The centre of the "opposition" is composed of members of that old group, standing for "democratic centralism," which for years has fought against the Party's line of action. To them were then joined former members of the Central Committee, who, at the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, on the proposal of Comrade Lenin, had not been re-elected (Preobazhensky, Smirnoff and Serebriakof). At the head of this oppositional bloc was found Comrade Trotsky.

THE IDEOLOGICAL CONTENT OF THE "OPPOSITION."

The divergencies between the great majority of our Party and the "opposition," as they appeared in the course of the discussion, may be summarised as follows:

1.—The "opposition" over which Comrade Trotsky presided, gave the word for the destruction of the Party apparatus, by trying to carry over into the Party the centre of gravity

of the struggle against bureaucracy in the State. A superficial criticism on this point, and the attempt to throw discredit on the Party apparatus, might have, objectively, the result that the State would extricate itself from the influence of the Party, and that the various State organs would be detached from us (the Communists). This tendency to withdraw the State organs from Party influence had been manifested by Comrade Trotsky since before the 10th Congress. In the present discussion this tendency has merely clothed itself in another form.

2.—The “opposition” endeavoured to oppose the young people to the fundamental structure of the Party and to the C.C. Instead of enlightening the youth upon the duty of the Party to shape itself according to its fundamental proletarian content, the Communist workers in the industries, the “opposition,” headed by Comrade Trotsky, sought to prove that the “Party barometer” was the youth of the schools.

3.—In order to lessen the authority of the C.C., the unique representative of the whole of the Party in between congresses, Comrade Trotsky made certain ambiguous allusions to a degeneration of the leading organs of our Party. Comrade Trotsky was not satisfied to oppose all the members of the C.C.; he has also preferred charges which have introduced confusion in large sections of the working class and have obliged the entire Party to raise a forcible protest.

4.—The bankruptcy of the “opposition” has shown itself particularly clearly in economic questions. The “opposition” has not known how to bring—and has not even attempted to bring—against the general policy of the Party, in economic questions, any proposals whatever, of even the smallest practical value.

In the criticism of the “opposition” of the economic policy of the Party, two tendencies may be observed. One part of the “opposition,” to a great extent affected by the phraseology of the “Left,” is against the New Economic Policy in general. This portion of the “opposition” has published statements in which one could only discover any sense whatever if one were to conclude that these comrades openly recommend us to renounce completely the New Economic Policy and to return to War Communism. The other—and far more influential—section of the “opposition,” contrarily, reproaches the C.C. with not being conciliatory enough towards foreign capital, for not having made sufficient concessions to the imperialistic powers, etc. This part of the “opposition” (Radek) has presented certain definite plans with regard to the revision of the conditions decided on by the

Party at the time of the Genoa Conference, recommending the granting of greater concessions to international imperialism, in order to aid commercial relations with foreign capital. The Party has not had the least hesitation in rejecting these two errors.

5.—The "opposition" in all its shades has interpreted the importance of Party discipline in a manner absolutely contrary to the Bolshevik viewpoint. The action of a large number of the representatives of the "opposition" constitutes an unheard of infringement of Party discipline, and reminds us of the time when Comrade Lenin was obliged to combat "the anarchism of the intellectuals" in questions of organisation, and to defend the elementary basis of proletarian discipline within the Party.

6.—The "opposition" has infringed the decision of the 10th Congress of the R.C.P., which forbids the formation of fractions within the Party. The "opposition" has replaced the Bolshevik conception, which considers the Party as an organic whole, by another conception which makes of the Party a composite of tendencies and factions. These tendencies, these factions and groupings, should, according to the "new" opinions of the "opposition," enjoy equal rights within the Party; while the Central Committee should cease to assume the leadership of the Party, in order merely to fulfil the function of an apparatus for registration, and to act as intermediary between the various tendencies and groups. Such a conception of Party structure has nothing in common with Leninism. The factional activity of the "opposition" has given new birth to the hopes of all the enemies of the Party, and of the European bourgeoisie, for a split in the Russian Communist Party. These factional activities, therefore, have compelled the Party once more to ask itself, with emphatic precision, if the Russian Communist Party, especially as a ruling Party, could ever permit the formation of factional groups within it.

Summing up the nature of the various divergencies, after an analysis of the true character of the "opposition," the Party Conference has arrived at the conclusion that the present "opposition," in the form in which it now manifests itself, brings before us, not merely an attempt at the revision of Bolshevism, and at a direct deviation from Leninism, but also of a deviation of a petit-bourgeois character in the truest sense of the word. It is not to be doubted that the "opposition" reflects objectively the pressure exercised by the petit-bourgeoisie upon the position and the policies of a Proletarian Party. Already outside the Party they are beginning to give a broader interpre-

tation to the principles of democracy within the Party, in the sense of a slackening of the proletarian dictatorship and an enlargement of the political rights of the new bourgeoisie.

In the Russian Communist Party, which incarnates the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and is, therefore, the only legal Party in the country, it is inevitable that certain weaker elements among the Communists sometimes succumb to non-Proletarian influences. The whole Party must take clearly into account these dangers and must energetically defend the proletarian standpoint of the Party.

The whole Party must undertake methodical and energetic measures against all petit-bourgeois deviations.

POSITIVE RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSION.

The growth in the activity, and the raising of the intellectual level, of large masses of non-Party workers and of numbers of working peasants constitute a new factor which, if the Party knows how to adopt an adequate policy in relation to it, will make for the progress of the Revolution. In order to accomplish its task, and to direct the masses of workers and peasants, who aspire towards an active participation in the Socialist Society, the Party must renew its internal life and render it more intense. In this sense, the discussion in the Party, in spite of the petit-bourgeois aberration of the "opposition," has brought it some useful results.

The petit-bourgeois errors of the "opposition" have been speedily and energetically corrected by the Party. Hardly had the discussions commenced within the Party, when, one after the other, the great proletarian sections of the Party subjected the petit-bourgeois proposals of the "opposition" to severe criticism and defended the policy of the Central Committee. As is always the case during discussions on principle within the Party, the Petrograd organisation of the Party, the oldest of Bolshevik proletarian organisations, was the first to raise its voice. Dozens of the greatest proletarian organisations of the Soviet Union rallied, without reservations to the point of view expressed in the letter of the Petrograd section. The resolution of the District Conference of Moscow Province, adopted by an overwhelming majority, condemned no less drastically the action of the "opposition." At the moment of the assembling of the Party Conference, all sections of the Party have already declared themselves, with a tremendous majority of votes, against these petit-bourgeois errors.

The result of the discussion is that the fundamental elements of the Party have cemented still closer their unity. The proletarian Party units, all over the Soviet Union, have unhesitatingly repudiated, in the most energetic fashion, the mistakes of the "opposition." The young generation within the Party, which has, for the first time, had an opportunity of observing violent discussion within the Party, has now had the occasion to learn, and to understand in its actual workings, true Bolshevism. Those elements of the Communist Youth which are in close contact with the factories have unhesitatingly defended the Party policy. The faltering of a part of the youth in the schools is but a passing phenomenon. By the task of education, which it will now undertake, the Party will soon succeed in removing this uncertainty.

The class-consciousness and the activity of all our members have increased. Once again serious economic questions, and questions concerning the internal life of the Party, have arisen with which we must deal.

It is with very special emphasis that the Party has stressed its decision to preserve its unity. The least allusion to the danger of a division has provoked, and does provoke, among the whole mass of our membership, the most vehement protest. The Party will politically destroy whosoever dares to attack its unity. The unity of the Party is now more assured than ever.

PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS.

In view of the general situation within the Party, the National Party Conference considers necessary the application of the following measures:—

1.—The proletarian fraction (noyau) of the Party must be reinforced and its role emphasised in the policies of the Party. During the coming year, work among the workers in the factories must be intensified in order to secure for the Russian Communist Party the adhesion of at least one hundred thousand genuine proletarians. As much as possible, access to the Party must be facilitated for the workers; and at the same time, the admission to the Party of non-proletarian elements must be suspended for this period. Methodical propaganda must be carried on within the Party in order to orientate it along the lines of its fundamental proletarian basis.

2.—In order to render closer the contact of the Party with non-Party workers, it is absolutely necessary that these non-Party workers obtain substantial representation within all the Soviets and all Soviet organs, not only on paper, but in fact. The Central Committee must be most vigilant in the execution of these decisions, and must call to order, in a most energetic fashion, those local organisations which do not abide by them.

3.—The Party organisation is specially required to increase the educational work among those units which, during the discussion which has just terminated, have manifested more or less hesitation with regard to Party policy. Education, and yet more education—this is the most important duty incumbent upon the principal organs of our Party.

4.—Special attention must be given to educational work among the youth. If financial resources are lacking, the Party should rather reduce the number of students, while bettering their material conditions and making a more drastic selection of the workers sent to the higher schools. It is indispensable that special measures be taken to ensure, for the work among the youth, a character corresponding to the general policies of the Party. The Party cannot allow any coddling of the youth, but, at the same time, it cannot tolerate that it be placed under a bureaucratic guardianship which does nothing but give orders. We can only arrive at the desired ends by patiently enlightening the youth on the fundamental principles of Leninism.

5.—One of the most important tasks consists in giving its right place to the study of the history of the Russian Communist Party, by emphasising the study of the struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism, the roles played by various fractions and tendencies during that struggle, and specially the role played by those eclectic sections which sought to "conciliate" Menshevism and Bolshevism. The Central Committee must undertake measures assuring the publication of summaries of the history of the Russian Communist Party in appropriate form, and of adequate circulation, at the same time making obligatory the study of the history of the Party in all Party schools, as well as in the high schools, debating clubs, etc.

6.—All organisations, following the example of our largest proletarian bodies, must establish clubs for the study of Leninism. In the first place, these clubs must study the complete work of Lenin, under the leadership of qualified comrades.

7.—The Central organ of the Party, the *Pravda*, must secure the collaboration of all competent elements, in order to deal methodically with the principles of Bolshevism and to combat all deviations therefrom.

8.—*Pravda* must reserve a special supplement for the present discussion.

9.—The liberty of discussion within the Party in no way implies liberty to weaken the discipline of the Party. The Central Committee, and the various district centres, must immediately adopt severest measures in order to maintain iron Bolshevik discipline everywhere where relaxations of discipline might appear.

10.—The most drastic measures, in certain cases going as far as expulsion from the Party, must be taken against all persons who, following the favourite method of those unprincipled elements who are contaminated by petit-bourgeois tendencies, spread rumours which are entirely without foundation or distribute documents which were not intended for public circulation.

11.—It is indispensable to improve the supply of information regarding the activity of the Central Committee and the internal life of the Party in general. Therefore, all members and substitutes of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission must regularly receive the stenographic reports of the plenary sessions of the Central Committee. *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and other journals, both at the centre and in the provinces, must enlarge that section devoted to the life of the Party. The Central Control Commission must establish a special Information Service.

12.—Particular attention must be given to the healthy and correct conduct of the Party's work within the army. The Party must take severe measures against any attempt at fractional activity within the Red Army.

13.—This conference believes it most useful to adopt without reservations and *in extenso*, the decision of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party on the prohibition of fractions. The conference considers it necessary to recommend to the Thirteenth Congress, as the supreme body of the Party, that it adopt the resolution on this matter.

14.—This conference recommends the Central Committee to apply Article 7 of the Resolution on Party Unity, adopted by the Tenth Congress on the Motion of Comrade Lenin. This Article confers upon the plenary meeting of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission the right, on a two-thirds majority vote, to reduce to the rank of a substitute of the Central Committee any member of the Central Committee who infringes the discipline of the Party, or carries on "fractional activities." Such activities may, of course, also lead to actual expulsion from the Party.

15.—The Party Conference cannot ignore the resolution passed at the last conference of the Moscow organisation. This resolution brings to the knowledge of the whole Party the fact that a fractional group was formed in Moscow which endangers the unity of the Party. This conference is of the opinion that the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission should immediately adopt the most stringent measures—in extreme cases even going so far as expulsion from the Party—against those members who, in the political centre of the Soviet Union, try to introduce the germs of division within the ranks of the Party.

This conference, in declaring the discussion on those questions which have recently been raised, as closed, throughout the whole country, invites all sections of the Party to re-assume their everyday labours. The essential condition for the future success of the Proletarian Revolution is the unshakeable unity of the Russian Communist Party, the Party which exercises the Proletarian Dictatorship. Party unity is the main victory of the proletarian vanguard, and must be defended with all zeal. This conference is convinced that the C.C., around which, as the results of the recent discussion have shown, the whole Party stands as firmly as ever, will know how to safe guard this unity by the most stringent measures.

Mayakovsky : Poet of the Russian Revolution

By HENRI GUILBEAUX.

THE Bolshevik revolution made counter-revolutionists out of most of the Russian poets. Revolutionists in words, virtuosi of the verb, clinging to an inconsistent ideology, the real overturn frightened and stampeded all these egocentrists. Rare were those who understood the Octobrists of 1917. Among the elders, Alexander Blok and Valira Brussov, both symbolists, were shaken by the cataclysm. Blok, whose intellectual antecedents drew him more to the social revolutionists than the Bolsheviks, failed to grasp the full meaning of the Revolution, but he was dazzled by it and admired it. His sentiments, confused and contradictory, but lively, were expressed in "The Twelve," which remains one of his most perfect poems. As for Brussov, whose 50th birthday was recently celebrated simultaneously in Moscow and Berlin, his comprehension of the events in October was manifested less in his work than in his activity, which was placed at the disposal of the Workers' and Peasants' Government from the very first day, though all the other intellectuals waited more or less passively for the fall of the "usurpers."

But the poet, who from the beginning understood, saluted, chanted, magnified and illustrated the Revolution was Vladimir Vladimirovitch Mayakovsky, who ceaselessly wrote songs, satires and other pieces out of a great and powerful inspiration.

Born on 7th June, 1894, at Bagdad, in the Caucasus, member of the Bolshevik Party from 1907, arrested several times for illegal activities, Mayakovsky founded some time before the war the Futurist school. This school has nothing in common with the silly nationalist futurism of Marinetti; but the poet erred in giving to the fecund literary movement of which he was the initiator, a term which stood for imperialism and for bourgeois decomposition. Mayakovsky has little in common with the histrionic rhymers and demagogic confectioners of the *Proletkult*; he reveals a genuine artistic sense and a real revolutionary spirit.

He understands the Russian people, their sufferings, triumphs, joys and worldly hopes, and he employs a language at

once rich, savage, ironical and popular, full of images and dynamically rhythmic.

In his great poem, "150,000,000," which he did not sign and for which he sought the collaboration of all his readers, he sought to make a kind of collective gesturing song. [To quote] :

"150,000,000 is the name of the writer of this poem—its rhythm is a bullet—its rhyme a flame leaping from house to house—150,000,000 men voice themselves through my mouth—with the rotary press of footsteps—on the edge of the pavements of public places—is this edition printed."

He traces the struggle between Ivan and Wilson; that is, between the proletariat and capitalism, for Wilson incarnates the capitalism which parades itself as democracy, parliamentarism, liberty and other idols, while Ivan—

"Russia—all of it—is a single Ivan—and his hand—is the Neva—and his finger-tips—are the Caspian steppes—let's go!"

This vast epic poem in which Mayakovsky appears as a kind of Whitman lifting up a Russia industrially Americanised, electrified, to a world freed of all oppression is characterised by a dominating force, the most daring images, and a dynamic and robust rhythm which is incessantly renewed.

At other times the rhythm of Mayakovsky is comparable to the footstep heavy, but quick and sure, of Ivan—worker, peasant, soldier—casting off oppression and servitude, starting upon his victorious march, and building not in words, but in deeds, the International. It is easy to understand why his *Lievy-Marche* (Left March), so simple and strong of rhythm, should have become so quickly popular not only in Russia, but in Germany, to such a degree that the masses chant it without knowing who the author was—which is glory indeed.

The Mystere-Bouff, given during the Third Congress of the Communist International, is a satire on capitalism and on the Second International, and a glorification of the Third International.

He developed still further his satiric gifts. The Party and the Rosta agency confided to him the task of writing the agitational poems placarded on the walls of all the cities, towns and villages included in the immense territory of the U.S.S.R. In a new collection, "Things of this Year," which has just appeared, Mayakovsky gives us several poems which can be considered as models of those which he so prolifically produces on all questions of reality.

Those who know Soviet Russia and read its newspapers may be tempted to compare Mayakovsky to Diemian Biedny, but whatever be the talent of the latter, he is given rather to journalism than to poetry, and is, in sum, a kind of Bolshevik Raoul Ponchon. Whatever be his manner and theme, Mayakovsky is always a poet and his treasures of rhythm and imagery are unforgettable.

"Things of This Year," besides certain satiric pieces such as the poem inspired by the ultimatum of Curzon to Chicherine, contains memoirs of a recent trip to Germany and France. Paris attracts him, but not the Paris of the bourgeoisie or of prostituted literature. The Eiffel Tower, which, with its wireless station to him represents the future, he would like to drag to the Paris of the Bourse and boulevard:—

"Tower—will you guide the crowd?—Tower—we elect you guide—It's not for you—model of the spirit of machines—here—to be stirred by the rhymes of Apollinaire . . .—For you—Paris is not the place—place where all putrifies—Paris of the prostitutes—of the poets—of the Stock Exchange.—The Underground is in accord—the Underground is with me."

The death of Vorovsky, the sickness of Lenin, bring no tears, no complaints, from Mayakovsky, but only masculine, energetic expressions, and grave, hardy decisions. The bulletins regarding the health of Vladimir Ilyitch, in particular, he rejects. Incarnating the thought of the whole Russian people, he refuses to heed alarmist news, for—is it not so?—the will of Lenin, the will of the Russian Communist Party, the will of the U.S.S.R. cannot flinch, or grow feeble.

In this collection also figures, "May First," a novel departure; instead of singing of the flowers, toil and the sun, Mayakovsky celebrates December and the snow, that is to say, Siberia, meaning that exile during which was tempered the iron will of many revolutionists and in memory of which, for the last five years, May Day has been celebrated as a public holiday throughout Soviet Russia.

The Party Conference

I WOULD like to take part in the discussion opened by Murphy, but Pollitt has made it almost impossible. "The Party" (he says) "was never so strong and influential in its history as it is now, and this *despite* the lack of finance, and the *influences of doubting comrades.*"

The words I have put into italics convey to me only one possible meaning—that certain people (to be identified as "doubting comrades") have used "influences" to prevent the Party's growth. And as it is clear from the article that a "doubting comrade" is one who does not accept Pollitt's estimate of the present state and needs of the Party, anybody who takes part in the discussion must either endorse his view, or stand branded (by Comrade Pollitt) as deliberately sabotaging the Party's progress.

Under these circumstances discussion is impossible—unless one strains charity to the limit and assumes that Pollitt was too angry to know quite what he was saying.

The whole article is a deplorable exhibition. It does not help us to rectify any defects in the Party's present procedure to say that "for two years prior to the Battersea conference . . . the Party had a full feast of the 'high politics school, revolutionary phrasemongering was the order of the day."

The question under discussion was whether we have completed the task undertaken at Battersea, and that question is not answered by a jibe at any "high politics school" (whoever and whatever they or that may be) nor by vague and unspecified charges of phrase-mongering.

At Battersea we resolved upon a plan of reorganisation. It is no answer to those who would modify that plan in the light of later experience to say that the Thesis of the Third Congress was "drafted by comrades of great experience and judgment." These comrades will no doubt be grateful to Comrade Pollitt for his unsolicited testimonial; but their qualities, good or bad, were never in question. The problem is whether we have succeeded satisfactorily in applying their general principles to our special circumstances.

It is no answer to those who think we have not so succeeded to tell us that the "big things the Commission's Report stood

for were correct." The assertion is a safe one. The Party adopted the Report unanimously, and these "big things" were, after all, just the principles of the Thesis. Moreover, the question does not arise upon the "big" things. It arises upon the details and the manner in which the whole conception has been applied.

The plain truth of the matter is that Pollitt refuses to see what is obvious to nearly everybody. The work of building a party involves a lot of things beyond a correct plan of organisation. It involves knowledge both of objective facts, and of psychological states and reactions. It involves many things that could never be defined in a report; and calls for qualities that not all men possess. It is sheer perversity for Pollitt to deny that in a large number of the departments and areas of the Party's work "Organisation" has been made an end in itself, and that many (probably a majority) of the members have only the vague notion of the purpose for which our plan of organisation was designed.

Pollitt himself gives a fine example of the sort of mental confusion that has grown up. "It sounds the real business (he says) to write about the "Need for Politics"; it will be much better for our Party when we try to learn how to apply them." Confusion, could hardly go further than in this divorce of "Politics" and the application of "them." Surely the most casual of readers must have seen that the whole of Murphy's contention was that our "application" was faulty, because of sheer lack of knowledge; that ability to devise and execute a political policy is dependent in great measure upon the quality and quantity of political knowledge available.

Given a whole party guessing blind in a fog of ignorance all sorts of proposals will be made, each justifiable in the degree of ignorance attained by its proposer, and the resulting chaos can only be resolved arbitrarily by the Authority of the Leading Party Committee. And that Authority can only be exercised (in such circumstances) at the price of creating a sense of contrast deepening into antagonism between the "inferior" and "superior" grades in the Party hierarchy, and a co-relative division of the tasks of the Party into the merely "mundane" and severely "celestial."

Pollitt accepts this division even to the extent of allotting the "petty detailed mundane" work the first place in the consideration of all *ordinary* Party members. He appears to think it presumption for anyone below the rank of District Party Committeeman to interest himself in anything else. That anybody

(not being a member of the Party Executive) should want to understand the "German situation" or "What is happening in Czecho-Slovakia" excites his gall. Hence this fine scorn of the "high politics school" and these cries of "phrase-mongering"—when it is suggested that the average party member does not know as much about the theory and practice of Communism as he should.

Pollitt admits that "discontent exists." "Of course it does!" he says. "It always will exist. . . ." The logic of which is, presumably, that as we can never hope for perfection, we have no right to complain about anything! I wonder what Pollitt would say of the capitalist apologist who reasoned in this fashion?

"Many of the grievances quoted by Murphy are imaginary ones," (he says). Is this a concession that some of them are real? If so, it is as much "up to" Pollitt as to anybody to propound "practical proposals" for their amendment.

There is, as he says, nothing to stop any member from sending complaints, and criticism to the Executive. A notable concession! But is the limit of human desire reached by the extension of permission to write to the E.C. about it?

* * * * *

Let me put one plain question to Pollitt: "Is an ignorant membership necessary to the working of the plan of organisation adopted at Battersea?"

I ask the question in cold blood and perfect seriousness, because, frankly I do not think he has at all "got down to" (that is, I believe, the accepted term?) the implications of his own argumentation. Does he think we shall best attract members to the Party by knowing nothing about Communism? Under the direction of our leading Committees, we must give the working class a lead to action! We are not at all sure what a "lead" is, and what we mean by "action" is hedged in ambiguities—still the leading Committee may understand, and anyway our job is only to carry out all instructions at the double, and stand to attention until the next order comes. This is quite definitely the sort of party that seems to be adumbrated in Pollitt's strictures upon Murphy.

More than that, it is quite definitely the sort of Party that seems to be desired by many who have had a hand in the process of re-organisation during the past 16 months. The warnings he quotes from the Commission's Report have been ignored in all but a minority of the Party groups.

We want a recrudescence of the enthusiasm that makes the most detail drudgery pleasant. But this can only come from *understanding*; enthusiasm arises from a faith fed with fresh *reasons* every day.

THOS. A. JACKSON.

* * * * *

Postscript.—In deference to the insistence of the Editor, I add a few words for the consideration of the Party members—other than Comrade Pollitt.

I dislike this clamour for “practical proposals” when it serves to smother the natural and proper demand for a survey of the whole field of our practice, and the correct valuation of its details from the standpoint of our general aim and intention. (Your ultra “practical” person is only too often one “who has mastered the art of using parliamentary machinery to prevent anything being done.”)

I do not desire to “scrap” or even seriously to amend the “Commission’s Report.” But I do affirm that we should take more note than we have during the last 16 months of the great truth that the Report itself underlines—that *the proper working of a single district* (upon a plan as comprehensive and elaborate as it presents) demands a membership-minimum equal to more than our whole present National strength.

It is not merely that such results as we have gained have been bought at the price of making the “maximum demands upon the membership”—as Murphy says. They have been bought at the price of exhausting almost completely the whole recruiting potentiality of the Party. The nuclei work, which should (one would think) be a means of gaining a constant stream of recruits has, so far, been a “mere ritual” whereby the detail members go through the motions of carrying out “instructions” from somewhere far away in the inner ramifications of the Party hierarchy. The meaning of the “instruction” (seldom instructive as they are) is lost because the *reason* for their adoption at the point of incubation is rarely given. The result is that 90 per cent. of the recruiting value of the concerted action is lost. The whole subject of the “United Front” and the “Labour Party” needs clarification throughout the Party even now.

The first thing that needs to be done, therefore, is to revive the *Party* life. New members must be obtained and in large numbers—even if it involves a temporary suspension of some of our

“ activities ” and an allocation of the energy thus released to pure propaganda. Even a resumption of the despised “ ritual ” of street corner meetings would in many districts have a salutary effect upon the psychology of the members—and produce its results in the increased power of personal recruiting.

With that must be adopted some method of breaking down the psychological isolation of the Central Committee from the detail membership. The proposal to shift the seat of the Executive from London to Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool or the Grass-market is childishness and should be treated accordingly. So also is the proposal to revert to a “ delegate ” E.C. In practice this means a sub-E.C. in London (or wherever the centre is), and the old situation all over again.

A better method would be to retain the Central Committee, and the Party Council as at present, with the alteration of making the meeting of the latter with the Central Committee a *plenary* session instead of a consultative one. I would add the members of the Control Commission also to the strength of this *full or enlarged* E.C. [choose terms to taste].

If at the same time members of the Central E.C. made a practice of touring the Provinces in turns they would not only add to the Party propaganda strength, but give, and receive lessons productive of good in exact proportion to the breaking down of the psychological gulf above-mentioned.

Even more important is the revival of meetings of members for discussing national and international topics. As it is the Aggregate Meeting once a month has an agenda so burdened with details and reports that little or no discussion is possible—except on the pettiest of petty details. The sense of boredom resulting is too awful for words. The “ old time branch,” which the Commission “ downed ” reappears in its ghastliest guise at the Aggregate Meeting.

The cure consists not so much in any definite “ practical ” proposal so much as a “ change of heart ” on the part of the Central Executive. It is to be counted unto Murphy for righteousness, that he perceives the need. It is to be recorded against Pollitt that he could only understudy the ostrich, and pretend that all was well because he refused to see anything amiss.—T.A.J.

[In view of the proceedings at the joint conference held at London on the 16th and 17th March, between the Central Committee and the District organisers with representatives from the District Committees in attendance, and the thorough discussion on Party organisation that ensued, this controversy is now closed.—Editor.]

International Review

RUSSIA.

100,000 NEW LENINIAN RECRUITS.

After the Party discussion, the Party Conference early in January decided on a campaign to enrol 100,000 new members into the Party from among workers "at the bench." With the growing class consciousness of the "non-party" mass, a large section of the workers were undoubtedly ripe to enter the Party. It was the death of Lenin, however, which galvanised this reserve, this potential membership into action, resulting in a tremendous, unprecedented rush of recruits from the working class into the Party. Everywhere, in the few days after Lenin's death, the workers met the news, first with appal, then with a resolve, spreading with the fervour of a religious revival, to join Lenin's Party—the Communist Party.

Now a month after Lenin's death, (Feb. 19th), more than 150,000 working class applications have been received to enter the Party, and what the Party Conference regarded as the work of a twelve-month has been exceeded in a short month, and the flow is still continuing.

The unprecedented feature of this rush into the Party is dwelt upon by Comrade Yaroslavski in the *Pravda* of February, 19th. The so-called "non-party" mass, at general meetings of factory and workshop, chose from their number those who are fit to enter the Party, "that which takes place at hundreds, and on the national scale at thousands of meetings, is something nowhere yet seen. This is the selection of 'the firmest, the very best,' as the non-party mass itself frequently designate this step. The list of applicants is subjected to the most searching, ruthless criticism. If anyone knows anything against, he must come out with it, —and in this, the non-party workers display immense concern for the party, so as not to injure it anew with unsuitable, wavering or doubtful elements.

"The non-party mass check the list of applicants before it comes up for examination by the Party local, and the Committee for reception of new members." Comrade Zinoviev declares that this rush of workers into the Party means a revolution in the

Party, placing it on impregnable foundations of class.

GOLD FOR PAPER ROUBLES.

These are the last days of the Soviet rouble. The Chervonetz bank-note has already squeezed out the rouble from a host of important trade transactions. At the Congress of the Union of Soviets in January, the Commissariat of Finance pointed out that the greatest sufferer from the falling valuta was the peasant, who had recourse to the chervonetz only with difficulty. A first step in the further displacement of the rouble was made in February by the issue of 5 gold-rouble notes, exchangeable at par with the chervonetz, and, therefore, guaranteed firm value. These were followed by one and three gold rouble notes.

These new notes will be issued according to demand, and also to cover the deficits in the State Budget which has been reduced for the current year to 100 million gold roubles. Meanwhile, the State mint is busy stamping silver and copper coinage, for moneys below one rouble, quantities of which will be simultaneously issued all over the country during the spring, continuing during the whole year.

The change over from the Soviet rouble to silver coinage will be facilitated in the early stages by the issue of short term coupons, redeemable at par in January, 1925, by which time it is planned to have the whole currency based on the firm gold valuta once more.

SHARPENING THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE PENAL LAWS.

The Central Control Committee of the Party propose to sharpen the class character of the penal code by various amendments to the present code. The most important of these is the proposal to devolve on the factory and workshop committees, to which an offender belongs, the task of adjudicating on minor offences, such as first offences of theft, etc., by workers pertaining to their sphere.

Compulsory labour as a punishment it is proposed to apply solely to *non-working class elements*, as owing to the delay in finding for the offender a place of work assigned by the court, this falls heavily on the worker, who is thus rendered workless, while the

non-worker is only too pleased. The new class distinction will put an end to this.

Hitherto also collective "bail has been prohibited. This again was a distinction against the worker in practice. Now collective bail, such as the guarantee of a factory committee, will be accepted in the case of a worker only.

(Apropos of the foregoing, it should be mentioned that the intervention of the Central Control Committee of the Party in the State apparatus is in accordance with the reorganisation of

the Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection which was Lenin's last public proposal in February, 1923. According to his proposal, the Central Control Committee of the Party was linked up with the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, the Commissariat reformed from top to bottom, and its function defined, as the watchdog of the proletarian dictatorship in the State apparatus. The chairman of the Central Control Committee is, *ipso facto*, Commissary of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection.)

D.I.J.

The Forum

SHOULD WE COMBAT RELIGION ?

Dear Comrade,

According to the "Workers' Weekly," (7th July, 1923), a recent meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the Comintern took the following decision: "That Communism represents a complete outlook on life, which excludes religion and logically involves atheism: propaganda against religion is essential. . . ."

I have asked our E.C. to put a Resolution on the Agenda of the forthcoming Conference to instruct the delegates to the next World Congress to question this decision, and other paragraphs of the kind in Party literature.

I claim that it is not religion itself that our Party should fight against, but only the falsification of it in the interests of capitalist society. If, as many comrades assure me, this is all that is meant, why not say what we do mean? Anything further than this is, I claim, not the business of our Party, which is engaged primarily in quite a different domain.

Besides, as regards the "supernatural" new facts are constantly coming to light, and there is no certainty. Moreover, even if the whole of the "supernatural" goes by the board, there still remains in religion the philosophy and ethics of Jesus, of Buddha, and other great teachers, which I for one would on no account combat, and which contain such great and illuminating ideas as for instance: "Ye are all members one of another; if one member suffer, all the others suffer with it"—the truth of which is being brought home to us more and more every day—*vide*

starvation of Central Europe—increase of unemployment here, etc., etc.

Even in the Churches themselves, a great change is gradually taking place, and some of the worst features of the above-mentioned falsification are being eliminated. For instance, the verse "The rich man in his castle" which used to horrify us all so much in our church-going days, is, I believe, now never sung, and is being expurgated from some hymn-books, being recognised as a blasphemous lie. The Churches, like the schools and the press, were long ago captured by capitalism; we should help to set them all free.

I cannot even agree that Communism represents a complete outlook on life—it seems to me to deal mainly with one set of human activities, (though no doubt many of the others will be profoundly modified by the coming of Communism itself). On all other subjects it seems to me we differ widely, and if we tried to have a Party that expressed every individual opinion, we might end by having as many Parties as there are individuals.

For these reasons, Comrade, I have sent along this resolution and hope any Groups agreeing with me will instruct their delegates to vote for it.

F. BALDWIN.
Paddington Group.

THE IRRATIONALISM OF MR. HAYNES.

Dear Comrade,

In the February issue of the "Literary Guide," I notice, and it may interest *Review* readers to know, that E. S. P. Haynes has been

letting off some of his anti-Socialist steam in the form of a letter on "The Future of Rationalism." This protagonist of bourgeoisdom is one of those literary cranks whose *ex cathedra* pronouncements are conceived in the true spirit of the medieval dogmatist, and the spectacle of Satan rebuking Satan is a somewhat diverting one. "Modern Socialism," says Mr. Haynes, dogmatically, "is begetting a gross tyranny," the "Russian Soviet" is grossly "intolerant," and "Russia is quite past praying for." He gives the palm as protagonist of liberty to those staunch pillars of the Papacy, Messrs. Chesterton and Belloc

and soundly rates his fellow atheists in the R.P.A. for attacking them. Apparently to Mr. Haynes all men are vile but himself, while to him alone is the monopoly of sweet reasonableness. In the light of psycho-analysis, however, we understand Haynes perfectly, and it is only by the method of projection that he is attributing part of his mental content to outside entities, just like the drunken sot in fact, who kicks his sober, hardworking, little drudge of a wife out of the house on the plea of her intemperate habits.

Yours fraternally,
CHAS. BAKER.

Book Review

Bloody American Capitalism: Its Murder of Labour. By JOE WALKER. 6d. Published by the Author. Farsley, Leeds.

By reprinting the series of articles which appeared in the *Yorkshire Factory Times* under the above heading, Comrade Walker has provided a useful booklet, which the propagandist can slip into his pocket when he wants to be prepared with instance after instance of capitalist brazenness, and brutality at their worst.

The examples quoted are authenticated by references, and the British workers need just now to realise how the rank and file of the American working class are treated by the cosmopolitan gang of capitalists who rule the United States from Wall Street.

Wall Street and the "City" are

already hand in glove—a friendship that bodes the workers no good in either country. Its evil effects can only be counteracted by better understanding and co-operation between the workers on both sides of the Atlantic. Such understanding and co-operation are hindered by the fulsome eulogies of American capitalists, which have too often disfigured the columns of the official Labour press. The American capitalists are the most powerful enemies with whom the international working class has to deal, and nothing can be more dangerous to the British Labour Movement than to fawn upon Wall Street in the name of international goodwill.

This little booklet reveals American capitalism for what it really is—a soulless despotism. W.T.C.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

La Genèse du Capital (L'Accumulation Primitive). Karl Marx. Librairie de L'Humanité. 2frs. 50c.

Socialisme Utopique et Socialisme Scientifique. Fred. Engels. Librairie de L'Humanité. 2frs. 50c.

Blanqui. Maurice Dommauguet. Librairie de L'Humanité. 2frs. 50c.

Bloody American Capitalism: Its Murder of Labour. By Joe Walker. Price 6d. Published by Author, Farsley, Leeds.

Fit to Govern! By "Iconoclast." Leonard Parsons. 2s. 6d.

James Connolly: His Life, Works and Writings, by Desmond Ryan, with introduction by H. W. Nevinson. Paper 2s. 6d. Cloth, 5s. Published by Labour Publishing Co., Ltd., 38, Great Ormond Street, London, W.C.1.

The Mass Strike. The Political Parties and the Trade Unions, by Rosa Luxemburg. Translated by P. Lavin. (Marxian Educ. Society, Detroit). 25 cents.

The Position of Parties and the Right of Dissolution. By Harold J. Laski. Published by the Fabian Society, 25, Tothill St., London, S.W.1. Price 2d.

I N D E X

VOLUME 4 (Part 2).

NOVEMBER to APRIL, 1924

AUTHORS.

	PAGE
BATTEN, E.—Agriculture, A Sweated Industry	353
The Subsidy Proposals	441
BELL, T.—The Crisis in the Russian C.P.	433
DANCHIN, V.—The Nationalist Labour Pact in South Africa	394
DICKINSON, H. D.—Inflation and Deflation: An Analysis and Criticism	361
D.J.P.—Jute Industries, Ltd.	437, 494
EPSTEIN, J.—Pacifism and Communism	333
(Translated by P. Lavin).	
GUILBEAUX, HENRI.—Mayakovsky: Poet of the Russian Revolution ...	534
HARDY, G.—The Coming Dock Strike	429
JACKSON, T. A.—The Message of March	468
The Party Conference	537
J.J.—The Case for the Y.C.L.	328
JONES, IVON.—Lenin's First Book	479
JOSS, WILLIAM.—The Crisis in Agriculture	321
J.V.L.—Hands Off Workers' Germany	368, 404
M.H.D.—Unemployment and the Coming Winter	309
MURPHY, J. T.—Empire Conference and the Workers General Election, 1923	296 347
The Party Conference	409
The Political Mind of Ramsay MacDonald	475

	PAGE
PAUL, WM.—Soviet Russia and World Crisis	315
POLLITT, H.—The Party Conference	447
ROEBUCK, C. M. and PALME DUTT, R.—The Labour Government, or the Class Struggle	511
R.P.A.—Real Economic Science	414
A Textbook of Revolution	453
STANLEY, E.—The Unemployed Workers' Charter : An Examination	520
T.B.—Lenin	302
TROTSKY, L.—The Task of Communist Education ...	324
"VERSUM"—Verses, Three Types	413
ZINOVIEV, G.—The Second Wave of International Revolution	388

* * * *

SUBJECTS.

AGRICULTURE	321, 353, 441
BIOGRAPHICAL :	
Lenin	302, 428, 479
Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg	401
BOOK REVIEW	380, 420, 458, 544
CONFERENCES :	
Party	409, 447, 537
Empire	296
CRISIS	315, 433, 526
CURRENCY, Inflation and Deflation	361
ECONOMICS, Science of	414
EDITORIAL VIEW	291, 343, 383, 423, 463, 507
EDUCATION, Communist	324
ELECTION, General, 1923	347

	PAGE
FORUM, The	378, 420, 503, 543
GERMANY, Hands Off Workers'	368, 404
INTERNATIONAL, Programme of Land and Forest Workers	489
INTERNATIONAL REVIEW	338, 457, 500, 542
JUTE INDUSTRIES, LTD.	437, 494
LABOUR GOVERNMENT OR CLASS STRUGGLE	511
MACDONALD, RAMSAY	475
PACIFISM	333
PARIS COMMUNE	468
POETRY	413, 534
REVOLUTION	388, 453
SOUTH AFRICA : Nationalist and Labour Pact	394
STRIKES, Dock	429
UNEMPLOYED	309, 520
Y.C.L.	328

