

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 15

28th February 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.
 — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliesslach 29, Vienna VIII.
 — Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

Leiter	Union of Soviet Republics
R. Albert: The Third International	G. Zinoviev: Lenin and the Workers.
Politics	In the International
J. B. Askew: The Prospects of the Labour Government	J. Amter: Third Convention of the Workers' Party of America
M. N. Roy: India and the British Labour Government	Book Reviews
Labour Movement	E. Varga: Philips Price: "Germany in Transition".
Tom Mann: The Dockers' Strike	

The Third International.

By R. Albert (France).

On the 5th March 1924, all sections of the Comintern will celebrate the 5th Anniversary of the grounding of the III. International. We call the attention of our readers to the following article by comrade Albert which has been specially written for this occasion. Ed.

Let us carry our minds back to the Year of Our Lord 1916: War Reports: "We have advanced 150 metres in the Artois area, Hill 30. Heavy artillery fire on the heights of..." Heaps of skulls are mounting up. Germany is reduced to her last piece of War Bread. Socialist Ministers are making journeys as envoys on behalf of the Holy Alliance of all classes! "Guns and ammunition!" — "Be on the alert: the ears of the enemies are everywhere..." Denounce the suspected. — Every day, every night, every hour has its hecatombs. They are slaughtering one another in Belgium and in France. Bombs are raining down on London. They are slaughtering one another in Poland and in Galicia. They are slaughtering one another in Upper Italy, in Salonica, in Serbia, in Turkey, in Mesopotamia and in the Caucasus. Steamships are being torpedoed in all the seas round the globe. The great guns of the Dreadnaughts have been heard thundering in the Falkland Islands. England carries on the blockade of Germany. Germany exerts all her forces in order to blockade England...

What will become of mankind? The economic and financial disaster is becoming more aggravated from minute to minute and is becoming irreparable. With the discharge of every gun, thousands of gold francs are squandered, which have been wrung from human labour in order to lacerate human flesh and to destroy human wealth.

It seems as if the war can still go on for many years. There is not the least sign of hope on the whole horizon. Millions of men, in the flower of their manhood, have been killed. Millions of others, who are being devoured by vermin, who are being rendered apathetic as a result of the discipline and the ever-present danger of death, and who are being inoculated with

patriotic hypocrisy, are waiting in the stench and putrefaction of the trenches for their turn to meet death in one or other of its most revolting forms. It seems as if nothing remains of the whole human heritage of culture and civilization.

Christianity? Catholics and Protestants alike are being led by their priests and clergy to the great butchery.

Science? It is thanks to her we have poison-gases, war aviation, Zeppelins, and all the perfections of artillery...

Socialism? Only yesterday, before the 4th August, it had been the greatest hope of all the working masses. The German, French and English Socialists vote for the war credits. Henderson is one of His Majesty's ministers, Vandervelde likewise. Guesde, Sembat, Albert Thomas, are ministers of the financial oligarchy which rules over the Third French Republic. Even anarchists as Kropotkin, Cornelissen, Malato, preach "the war of Right against Teutonic Imperialism", the enlisting of the revolutionaries in the ranks of the armies of Joffre, Nivelle, Foch, Douglas-Haig and of the Grand-Duke Nicolai Nicolayevitch...

One must carry one's mind back to those years of horrible nightmare, in order to be able to comprehend the whole greatness of the III. International.

In the same hour, when the irreparable bankruptcy of Socialism took place, hardly thirty days after the proletariat had been betrayed by all the acknowledged leaders of the II. International, an obscure revolutionary refugee in Switzerland, the leader of a small party renowned for inexorable intransigence, wrote the following words:

"The II. International is dead, overcome by opportunism... The II. International has accomplished its task of useful preparatory work, of organizing the proletarian masses during the long "Peace period" of severest capitalist enslavement and of most rapid capitalist development, during the last third of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth... It will be the task of the III.

International to organize the forces of the proletariat for the revolutionary attack against the capitalist governments, for the civil war against the bourgeoisie of all countries, for the political power, for Socialism!"

These were the lines which Lenin wrote in the (Russian) "Social Democrat" at Zurich on the 1st November 1914.

Throughout the whole of war-delirious Europe, this revolutionary was perhaps the only man who foresaw the ways of the future. For about thirty years he had been fighting. For more than ten years he had been working for the preparation of the Russian Revolution. When Plekhanov said: "The Russian Revolution will be victorious as a proletarian revolution, or it will not be victorious at all", Lenin, thrusting aside all doubts, declared: "The Russian Revolution will be a proletarian revolution and it will be victorious." In 1906, when the crushing of the first Russian revolution by Nicolaus II and French finance scattered the Russian socialists, Lenin affirmed: "Another battle is unavoidable. Let us prepare for it." In 1915 and 1916 he went to Zimmerwald and Kienthal, where also other Internationalists went who were gropingly seeking a way; he went there in order "to prepare the foundation of the III. International".

The Russian Autocracy had scarcely been overthrown by the people of Petrograd (27th February 1917), when Lenin, who was then still in Switzerland, hailed the Petrograd Soviet as a "new workers' government, representing the interests of the proletariat and the poorer portions of the population of the town and country" and announced to the Russian workers "the second stage of the Revolution, their Revolution" (Letter published by the Petrograd Pravda of 21st and 22nd March 1917).

And on the 10th April 1917, stating the "collapse of the Zimmerwald International" which was too hesitant and centrist, he wrote already amidst the whirlpool of the Russian Revolution: "It is necessary to found the III. International!"

On the 5th March 1919, in the Kremlin, there was founded the III. International. The International rose again in a land of revolution, which was being blockaded and starved, and was marked down for assassination. This country has emerged victorious. The International has emerged victorious. Within five years, the III. International has grown rich in a revolutionary past, being as rich in work, achievements and sacrifices as the International of the reformist pseudo-socialists and that of the anarchist mouthers are as poor in these things . . .

To these last two, the Communists when summing up their work during these last five years, are entitled to put the question: What have you achieved? Have you produced a single new work? Have you carried out any action? Where are your new men? Where are your sacrifices?

The old Socialism of compromises of every kind is continuing with Kautsky, Ebert, Noske, Vandervelde, Renaudel, Otto Bauer and Henderson. Its greatest successes are electoral ones. Its victories consist in supplying ministers to the old financial oligarchs. The old Anarchism repeats its old formulas, adding to them, — as the sole acquisition of the last years — Anti-Bolshevism. Its founders — who were great men — depart one after the other and are replaced by vile calumniators of the first Social Revolution of modern times . . .

The III. International is born of the revolutions of Russia and Central Europe. The workers' insurrections of Germany, the Soviet revolution of Hungary, more recently the Bulgarian revolution and the revolutionary preparation in Germany, bear witness to the energies which it bears within itself. Nearly every country in Europe has, during the last year had its own "Communist Conspiracy"; in nearly every one of them communists are still imprisoned; in several the Communist Party is illegal. So much as regards action.

In these first five years of existence of the III. International, 11,000 communist proletarians have been massacred by the Reaction in Finland; perhaps an equal number in Hungary; even more in Germany; some thousands in Bulgaria. The International preserves the memory and continues the work of a vast number of its great Dead: Lenin, Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin, Yogishes. The American John Reed, Raymond Lefebvre. The Japanese Sakai. The Hungarian martyr Otto Corvin. Nearly all of them assassinated. So much for sacrifices.

In these five years, the III. International has been unweariedly working at elaborating its methods and its doctrines. It is sufficient to call to mind the labours of its congresses, the vast intellectual labour of the Russians. So much for thought.

Vast tasks yet confront the III. International. Notwithstanding all its successes, the III. International is aware of its imperfection, and of the necessity of still further elaborating and perfecting its methods, in order to create the International Communist Party which will not only rid the world of the old Society, but will also bring to birth the New Society of an emancipated Humanity.

POLITICS

The Prospects of the Labour Government.

By J. B. Askew.

In one respect MacDonald occupies a position that is enviable and almost I suppose without precedent. No one expects him to do anything at all — everybody feels that his hands are tied, that there is very little that he can do, and hence for his failure, should such occur, he can only shrug his shoulders and ask any would-be critic — what else did you expect of me? On the other hand, any small achievement which he or his government manage to make will be magnified a hundredfold, the Daily Herald will hardly find terms to express its rapturous admiration for such divinely inspired statesmanship, and the London correspondents, both of the Social Democratic Vorwärts and the liberal Berliner Tageblatt are already busy explaining to the world what a wonderful man he is.

To a certain extent the position of the Labour Party in England to-day is similar to that in which the Social Democratic Party of Germany found itself in 1918 — namely in that the Labour Party has been forced into power, not because of its own exertions or as a fruit of its own success, but because of the failure of the Bourgeois Parties. The other circumstances are naturally different. In consequence of the breakdown of the whole machinery of Society the Social Democratic Party of Germany found itself in a position when it was open to it to start a socialist policy — and the fact that instead of doing so it ran away, or rather called in the capitalists was due; on the one hand to the fear of the steps that would be taken by those Western Democratic Governments, which even to-day all good Social Democrats Kautskyaner and Bernsteinianer prefer to Moscow's wicked tyrants; and on the other to the demoralisation produced in its own ranks by its own teachings during the four years of war, when on its own showing the class war or the antagonism of classes had been superseded by the theory of the harmony of class interests within the nation.

The British Labour Party is in the same position in so far as its leaders have all along been protesting that they never believed in the existence of a class war or an antagonism of interests between the propertied or non propertied classes. Not that any of them were able or dared to put forward a consistent and clearly thought out alternative for the class war or to speak directly for the permanent solidarity of classes, but their very vagueness on the point serves to make of them so much the more efficient instruments of the Counter-Revolution than they would be were they more clear, and above all it would be very hard to reconcile with even the most platonic adhesion to a socialist programme.

The Labour Party has earned much praise owing to its recognition of the Soviet government, or rather the Union of Soviet Governments in Russia, but it is not a little curious that it should have been the conservative Ex-Prime Minister who called attention to the extremely offensive words addressed by Mr. MacDonald as Prime Minister, when he said the Labour Party would stand no nonsense and no monkey tricks from the Russian diplomatic representatives. Mr. Baldwin asked "Can anyone imagine these words being applied to the American or French Ambassador?" Taken in conjunction with the fact that the Labour Party Leaders have always spoken of the Soviet Government as a foreign government, in other words as meaning no more to us than any of the ordinary bourgeois governments, as well as the fact that MacDonald omitted to send any message on the death of Lenin, who was actually at the time of his death the chief representative of the Russian State, whereas he sent one on the death of Ex-President Wilson, makes his attitude all the more significant.

It is significant as it is characteristic of all small bourgeois politicians and parties to wobble between the two extremes — what Marx always described as the policy of "einerseits —

anderseits" (on the one hand on the other) which he declared exhausted the whole of their wisdom — the attempt to make concessions to both sides, to make up for a concession to the left by one to the right, to make up for a concession to the Bolshevik government by remarks calculated to prove to the Bourgeoisie that it is quite unjust to call the Labour government the slaves of Moscow. It is quite bad enough to hear the conservatives attacking then as the obedient servants of the Hamburg International, as cowering under the whip of Fritz Adler, but it would be still worse to incur the suspicion of being the disguised agents of Moscow. Therefore, what more natural than the idea of proving to their dear bourgeois friends, their independence of the hated Moscow tyranny than by flinging a few words of insult to Moscow to show how independent they were.

In the meantime the class struggle has an unpleasant knack of making its pressure felt as a permanent and ever present "fact" in capitalist society, despite all attempts to get rid of it or describe it as mere theory, so that in spite of all appeals to the workers to desist from strikes and to trust to the Parliamentary action of the Labour Party, one big strike is scarcely ended before another looms on the horizon. Naturally the aim of the Labour leaders and ministers on all such occasions is to arrive at a settlement on the good old fashioned lines, above all to prevent the strike spreading; and the effect if not the aim of such action is to make it possible for the employers to play off one section of the workers against another, to encourage them to sabotage each other's actions in the hope of gaining some little privilege for their own little section. Above all no government ever helps the employers — oh dear no — they only act in the Public interest in maintaining food supplies etc. In that way all strikes get sabotaged — quite decently and in order.

The recent elections shew to all who took part in them a most gratifying growth in the class consciousness of the organized British workers. But at the same time the question was bound to arise: "what will be the effect on these people if the Labour Party should fail in its task? Will they not simply fall back into that indifference from which they have been rescued with such difficulty?"

Is it however likely that the Labour Party even within the narrow limits set to it will be able to do anything on administrative lines if not legislative? There is at present this element in its favour — that no government is really prepared to take its place. The Conservatives seem divided on protection, and the time is hardly ripe for a Conservative Liberal Coalition or for a mutual agreement between these two parties to support each other against Labour. Both parties have the uneasy feeling that while such a coalition would give them an immediate advantage, it would be at the cost of clarifying the position in regard to the class struggle between the propertied and non propertied classes, which it has been the ever-constant aim of the propertied classes to disguise and conceal.

At the moment of writing the existence of the Labour Government is threatened by the Liberals who have challenged its policy in regard to Poor Law Administration — but the issue will hardly be one on which the Liberals or any bourgeois party would or could challenge the Labour Party would be afforded success at an Election, at least the Labour Party would be afforded such a favourable rallying cry, as it had never had. It is more likely that the whole issue will be closed by a compromise — that is by an investigation into the system of poor law, or a promise to change the whole system on the ground of certain reports. Even in the Conservative press the whole question seems to be regarded much more as one for compromise than for fighting over.

In regard to India and Egypt, which at one time seemed likely to cause trouble, it may be doubted whether a compromise will not be effected at the cost, again no doubt, of the workers in those countries. Both the Egyptian and Indian Nationalists would seem likely to try for a compromise — the Egyptians have already got one with the recognition of their government, and it seems only too likely that the Swaraj Party in India are aiming at coming to some sort of an agreement with the Government.

In this respect it may be remarked that MacDonal, in forming his ministry, has adopted the old principle of British Prime Ministers, according to which a Minister was never appointed to a post of whose work he had made a special study. A man who knew all about Mines was sent to administer the colonies and vice versa, and so it is this time. That means that the bureaucracy retains a tremendous power in its hands, because the new Ministers have all got to learn their tasks first and are entirely dependent on the permanent officials.

Much talk is going on at the moment about the attitude of the Labour Party towards the resolutions of the Imperial Conference — but it has cut the Gordian knot in agreeing to leave the decision to the House of Commons, in which the Liberals and Labour Party form a majority, so that on the question of protective tariffs, they are hardly likely to be frightened by the suggestion that a vote against the decisions of that Conference would be an insult to the Colonies. The Labour Party in Australia would be the first to repudiate any such nonsense.

The Labour Government, in short, is likely to wait till the bourgeois Parties can compose their differences, which would certainly be very soon were the Labour Party to attempt anything that was seriously unpleasant for them or threatening their interests. The main interests for the Labour Movement is that the issue should be so chosen by its leaders that the class nature of the bourgeois claims should be made as clear as possible. Having been forced by the bourgeoisie into power, it is the interest of the Labour Party to utilize the power that has been forced on it for determining the field on which it will take up the fight with the bourgeoisie. Whether the Labour leaders do that or not — that seems to me the acid test for the Labour Government.

India and the British Labour Government.

By M. N. Roy.

It is generally known that the British Labour Party came to office not by dint of its own parliamentary strength, but by the grace of the Liberals. Without the support of the Liberals, the Macdonald Cabinet cannot live a single day. In fact, Mr. Macdonald did not take the responsibility of forming a Labour Government without being assured that the Liberals would not only vote for his amendment to the Kings Speech, but would continue supporting him while in office. This invisible coalition could not be realised just for the asking. The anxiety of the Liberals to overthrow the Tories was not so strong as to put a "Socialist" Government in office instead. Mr. Macdonald had to pay dearly for this invisible coalition which has made his residence at No. 10 Downing Street possible.

The extent of the price with which the very uncertain Liberal support has been purchased, is very far-reaching. This fact is not generally comprehended. That section of the Labour Party, which would not permit an open coalition with the Liberals, would be staggered if they stopped to think how much of the Labour Program had been sacrificed. The Capital Levy and Nationalization of Mines were the two planks that distinguished the Labour platform from that of the Liberals. They have been unceremoniously rejected as outside of the realm of practical politics. The same Mr. Snowden, who but a few weeks ago declared that the economic life of Great Britain could not be saved without a Capital Levy, is to-day engaged with equal enthusiasm in the task of salvaging British Capitalism without the Capital Levy. The question of Nationalization is very conveniently forgotten. His duties in the Admiralty do not permit Mr. Hodges to bother about other questions. Mr. Smillie's radicalism is evidently damped by age. Or is he bewildered by the rapid march of events so adroitly manipulated by the "intellectuals" in the labour movement? Whatever it may be Nationalization is rejected. It is done because the Liberals demanded it. They would not permit the least tampering with the sacred right of property.

In addition to these very large concessions made in the realm of home politics, Mr. Macdonald had to guarantee that he would not do anything to weaken the Empire in the least. Here he sacrificed two of his most precious personal principles, namely, Disarmament and Self-determination. Of course, he would not admit that this sacrifice has been made. In fact, he still talks of disarmament if not of self-determination. But so also do Lloyd George and Asquith. The military strength of the British Empire will remain intact under the Labour regime. In his Program speech in Parliament, Mr. Macdonald declared that the question of disarmament will be discussed without impairing in any way the forces of defence.

As regards the principle of Self-determination, Mr. Macdonald has swallowed his own words no less remarkably than the prophet of this cult, the late lamented Woodrow Wilson. Even before he came to office he had made it unmistakably clear through the repeated declarations of his colleague, Mr. J. H. Thomas, that the Empire would be perfectly safe in the custody

of a Labour Government. Since then, he has put the same Mr. Thomas (who according to his own words loves the Empire and is proud of it), in the Colonial Office, which is permeated with the spirit of such personalities as Winston Churchill and the Duke of Devonshire. Mr. Macdonald acted so wisely as regards the three pivots of the Empire, namely, India, the Navy and the Air Forces, that he merited the approbation of the Times. The day after the composition of the Labour Cabinet was announced, this organ of Imperialism congratulated Mr. Macdonald upon the happy choice he had made for the three vital offices concerning the Empire. Indeed the incumbents for the India Office, Admiralty and the Air Ministry surprised even those who entertained little illusion about a "Labour Government" headed by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. An experienced colonial governor, Sir Sidney Olivier went to the India Office; Lord Chelmsford of Amritsar fame and not a member of the Labour Party, became the head of the Admiralty; and a reputed member of the Military Caste, General Thomson, was selected to be the custodian of the Air Forces, the back-bone of the army of the future. The bourgeoisie, as it were, was allowed to station its own sentinels within the citadel of the Labour Government, to guard the three vital spots of the Empire. Mr. J. H. Thomas had proved himself perfectly reliable to be entrusted with the Self-governing colonies. He is an ardent advocate of Empire development, and stands for sending out not only British capital, but British man-power as well, to exploit the "incalculable riches of our splendid possessions."

In making at least one of these sacrifices in the imperial sphere Mr. Macdonald, however, was not quite within his rights. Being the elected head of the British Labour Party, he is legally competent to distort its program in any way he likes, provided that his flock acquiesces in this act of distortion. But his liberal professions, particularly of the doctrine of Self-determination, won for him admirers among the Indian Nationalist leaders. These expectantly looked to Mr. Macdonald's advent to office as the beginning of the era when the principle of self-determination would be put into practice in India. One of the prices that Mr. Macdonald paid for Liberal support to his assuming office, was to throw over-board these Indian admirers of his. Here, however, he paid the price in coins that did not belong to him. The Indian Nationalists did not delegate to him the authority to interpret the aspirations of Indian Nationalism as it suited his convenience, nor would they permit him the privilege of dictating haughtily the lines they should follow. Consequently, his Indian policy has raised a hornets' nest. The advent of the Labour Government to office has filled Nationalist India with indignation and disillusionment, rather than with hope and friendliness, as would have been the case had Mr. Macdonald not sacrificed his Socialism on the altar of imperial interests.

It is true that the faith of Indian nationalists was misplaced in Mr. Macdonald. He wrote much about India; but he never advocated self-determination for India half as ardently as he did, for instance, in the case of Georgia. But there were other reasons which accounted for the partial optimism that prevailed in India concerning the Labour Government. These were the pronouncements of some leading members of the Labour Party, who are looked upon as specialists on the Indian question. Col. Wedgwood is the leading figure, Ben Spoor occupying the second place. These two gentlemen visited India in the hey-day of the Non-cooperation campaign. They were present in the Nagpur Congress (1921) when the program of Non-cooperation was finally adopted. They in the same year attended the first session of the All-India Union Congress, as fraternal delegates from the British Labour Party. It is true that on his return home, Col. Wedgwood expressed himself against the campaign of Non-cooperation which in those days was a great mass movement fraught with revolutionary possibilities; nevertheless he partially approved of the nationalist claims and gave to understand that when labour came to office in Britain these claims would not be overlooked.

During the last year, as the possibility of a Labour Government drew nearer, speculation as to the personality of the Labour Secretary of State for India was rife. Col. Wedgwood was generally looked upon as the candidate. His advent to the India Office was considered to be a foregone conclusion. The surprise of the Indian press was great when Wedgwood was not sent to the India Office by Mr. Macdonald. The choice did not even fall upon the second best man, Mr. Ben Spoor. The appointment of Sir Sydney Olivier was as unpopular in India as it was satisfactory to the British ruling class. To the average

Indian, it does not make any impression that the new Indian Secretary is an old Fabian. What forms his judgment is the fact that Sir Sydney is an old member of the Colonial Civil Service, an institution heartily hated and suspected, with ample reason, in India. Let it be repeated that there are indeed few among the Indian nationalist leaders who expected that the advent of Col. Wedgwood in the India Office would work a miracle. But in the light of his pronouncements, a certain amount of optimism was natural. These very pronouncements, which caused a lingering hope in India, however, deprived the colonel of the coveted job.

Now, what were the crimes of the gallant colonel? Did he by any chance stand for the freedom of India? Or did he even promise that the highly constitutional and modest demands of the Indian bourgeoisie would be immediately granted? Nothing of the kind. Even as far back as 1921, when the responsibility of office was not in sight, he deprecated the Gandhian movement of passive resistance. So it is simply idle to think that he would insist upon the literal application of the doctrine of self-determination to India. The fact that even he could not be accommodated speaks for the imperialist nature of the so-called Labour Government. His appointment would have created a very good impression in India to begin with; but might have led to eventual difficulties by raising unwarranted hopes.

The message that Mr. Macdonald sent to India upon his accession to office is well-known. Any other prime minister could have attached his name to such a communication. One might ask; why did he send such an excessively discouraging message? There was ample reason; it was to counteract the effects of some statements made by the presumptive Secretary of State for India. If Mr. Macdonald would not disassociate himself from the policy that Col. Wedgwood promised to pursue if he came to the India Office, he could not get that benediction of the British bourgeoisie without which he could not be the prime minister of the British Empire. Only the relegation of the indiscreet Colonel would not suffice; the prime minister must declare that the views of his discredited lieutenant are not his own.

Speaking before the University Labour Federation on Jan. 12, Col. Wedgwood said: "India will prove the test of a Labour Government. The Labour Party hopes to overcome the difficulties by accelerating the conversion of India into a Self-governing dominion. This depends not merely on matters of finance, defence and internal order, but on the winning of the Indian Nationalists to meet them half way... The aim of the Labour Party is a British Commonwealth of peoples of various colours and a free union of free peoples."

This was too much for the British bourgeoisie. They could not permit a party with such subversive ideas to be at the helm of the country. It would be preposterous. When Mr. Macdonald looked hungrily at the votes of the Liberal minority that controls today the most democratic parliament of the world, he was reminded of those indiscreet pronouncements of his colleague. If he would have the good graces of a wing of the bourgeoisie, he must atone for the sins of his less diplomatic followers. He must eat the words of the guileless colonel, and inform his Indian admirers that self-determination is allright when it does not concern the Empire too closely, but when the safety of the British Empire is involved, he would not tolerate any monkey tricks (to quote his polite words used subsequently in relation to a great power with which he was eager to trade).

It was not only the bourgeoisie at home that Mr. Macdonald had to deal with. There were also the colonial pro-consuls to be reckoned with. Col. Wedgwood's statement enraged the latter, and they clearly said that they did not care a damn what the Labour Government thought or did; they would know how to defend their privileged position. Thus wrote the Englishman of Calcutta, the most authoritative semi-official organ: "It ought to be obvious to Col. Wedgwood that he cannot accelerate self-government by the mere stroke of an India Office pen: Self-government can only be brought about by a modification or substitution of the Act, and this cannot be done without the consent of Parliament. But in their present position the Labour Party cannot possibly hope to carry such a measure without the support of the Liberals; and Mr. Lloyd George's followers are not likely to favour any premature speeding up of what their leader described as 'an experiment.'" Then the organ of the Colonial lords boldly takes up the challenge, if challenge it was: "Should he (Col. Wedgwood) still be disposed to pursue such mischievous tactics, he would have to reckon with the Viceroy. We believe that Lord Reading will act as a very necessary buffer to a too pushful Secretary of State."

So there you are! What can one do while in office, but not in power? One must be a practical politician, and sacrifice all programs and principles if they stand in the way to the glories of office. The bourgeois dictatorship at home cannot be got around by means of parliament, which is a weapon of bourgeois dictatorship; on the other hand, the ruling class will always be beyond your power unless you are prepared to pull it down by helping the subject races to rise in revolt. But the British Labour Party, as it is today, desires neither the one nor the other. It stands for democracy at home and Imperialism abroad.

By rejecting Nationalization and the Capital Levy, the Labour Government proved its capability to rule at home; while by shaking his mailed fist at India, the expacifist Ramsay Macdonald convinced the British bourgeoisie at home and in the colonies that he can keep subject races in domination, that he is a Britisher first and Socialist last. Here are some of the choice words which he hurled at the Indian Nationalists who expectantly looked up to him as a man of just principles, and above all as the leader of the British proletariat, which does not have any reason to be attached to the Empire even if its leaders are proud of it.

In the course of his notorious messages to India Mr. Macdonald said: "I can see no hope in India if it becomes the arena of a struggle between constitutionalism and revolution. No party in Great Britain will be cowed by threats of force or by policies designed to bring government to a standstill; and if any sections in India are under the delusion that that is not so, events will very sadly disappoint them. I would urge upon all the best friends of India to come nearer to us rather than stand apart from us, to get at our reason and our good will."

The gravity of some of these words are immense. In one sentence he dispels any doubt that might have been created somehow or other concerning the imperial policy of the Labour Party. Instead of giving any indication that, true to his profession of self-determination and democracy, he would in any way modify the present unquestionably irresponsible and autocratic government of India, Mr. Macdonald pledges the Labour Party to the task of suppressing any attempt of the Indian people to free themselves in a way not liked by Mr. Macdonald and his taskmasters, the British bourgeoisie. And all this sword-rattling at whom? At the Indian Nationalists, who are strict adherents of the constitutionalism so dear to Mr. Macdonald. He bids them to "get at our reason and our good will". But he forgets that everybody may not look upon him just as he looks upon himself. Indians can have as much faith in his reason and good will as in those of Curzon. To Curzon at least they can concede the credit of consistency to principle; but the same cannot be said of Mr. Macdonald.

Ever since the Labour Government came to office, ample expression has been given to this feeling in the Indian press. Only a few days ago a nationalist leader of moderate views stated in the Legislative Assembly that India questioned the good faith of the new Labour Government. By stepping in the shoes of Curzon, Mr. Macdonald has won the good graces of the British bourgeoisie, who are letting him do their dirty job, but events will sadly disappoint him if he believes that he and his colleagues will succeed in establishing Labour Imperialism. If Imperialism triumphs he will be pushed into abject ignominy like his German confrères, in spite of the thankless services rendered. The Indian people will be free, just as surely as the British proletariat will outgrow the present leaders. Had Mr. Macdonald followed the policy of killing by kindness, India's struggle for freedom would have been sabotaged by winning over the native bourgeoisie. The attitude of the Labour Government has indirectly helped the cause of Indian freedom, while it has damned the Labour aristocracy and the so-called Socialism of the I. L. P.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Dockers' Strike.

By Tom Mann.

The following article by comrade Tom Mann was written before the termination of the recent strike of the English Dock Workers but we are publishing the same as it still retains its interest. Ed.

Great Britain being a comparatively small island, plus the fact that it is essentially an industrial country engaged primarily

in manufacturing and trading, makes it particularly susceptible to strikes by workers in the Ports.

No other country is affected in like degree. The population in the middle of the country is generally quite seriously affected if stoppage of work at the ports lasts for three or four days.

The strike that is now on in the ports was not a spasmodic sectional strike, but was definitely agreed upon weeks beforehand by the Transport and General Workers Union representing — not all — but a large percentage of the total men affected.

The Unions demand was for an increase of 2/- (two shillings) a day and for a guaranteed week's pay. At the first conference between the representatives of the men and the Employers, the latter in the person of Lord Devonport, the Chairman of the port of London Authority, dealt very abruptly with the men's demands, refusing to grant some and closing discussion.

When this was put before the men's delegates, it was definitely decided to strike and the date was fixed.

The Transport Workers Union is related to the Trades Union Congress, and obtained the sympathetic support of the General Council of that body, which was duly announced. Also the National Union of Railwaymen, many of whose members work in and about the docks, officially resolved to associate itself with the dockers in their struggle. The Stevedores and Lightermen's Union (claiming to have some 20,000 members) had already put in a claim to the employers for 2/6 (two shilling and six pence) per day increase. Thus, from the stand point of organisation, although there was no expressed unanimity on the part of all connected with transport by land and sea, the Dockers were in a strong position as the cost of living had gone up considerably. The decision of the delegate meeting of the men was to claim only that amount they were determined to fight for, and not to put in a claim for a higher amount in order to concede something in negotiation. Therefore, while various proposals had been made demanding an increase of four or five shillings, they were voted down to an irreducible minimum claim of two shillings increase per day. And all the officials of the union heartily supported this and acted accordingly. The one item other than wages which was to be claimed was that of "a guaranteed week" or the "decasualisation" of Labour at the docks — meaning that a man shall have a week's wages every week no matter whether he is wanted for the whole or only a part of the week. This principle had been thrashed out several years ago and the employers had expressed concurrence with the principle. This really is a most important matter, and is sure to be demanded by workers generally in the near future. It means the registration of workers in an industry, which registration will involve adequate maintenance continuously, irrespective of the state of trade. This of course will force considerations of using men more systematically and less casually, and in a similar degree it will reduce the number of persons employed; it will mean regularising conditions for some and shutting out others entirely.

Still, the principle is right, and the aim must be to have every industry so organized that only the required number will be connected with that industry; naturally those not wanted will have something to say, but equally every sensible person employed will also have something to say, and that will be — that the hours of labour must be adjusted, so that all shall share in the work to be done.

One of the new Labour members of Parliament, himself a Transport Workers' Trade Union Official, Mr. Ben Smith, M. P. for Rotherhithe, is responsible for bringing forward a Bill in Parliament entitled: the Dock and Waterside Decasualisation Bill. At present it is a private members bill and Mr. Smith has won the right in ballot for opportunity to introduce the Bill in May. It provides a National Joint Council for Port Labour, composed of equal representatives of port employers and employees, to co-ordinate registration, insurance schemes etc. with a view to decasualisation, and the regularising of incomes.

At the time of writing, Friday 22 February, the strike is still on, the Employers having agreed to pay 1/- increase: at once and another 1/- in June. A delegate meeting of the men has refused to wait till June and further negotiations will follow; probably resulting in work starting on Monday next. This present dispute is to be looked upon as one of many yet to follow, each making towards the organized solidarity of the Workers. This is also making for Mass Action on the general field of Industry and notwithstanding hesitancy and indecision, it is undoub-

tedly making definitely for the Social Revolution. The organized Labour Movement of Britain is slowly but surely preparing for the overthrow of Capitalism and Comrades in other countries may count on this.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

Lenin and the Workers.

By G. Zinoviev.

In her article dedicated to the memory of Karl Marx, Rosa Luxemburg wrote:

"If we wish to formulate in a few words what Marx accomplished for the contemporary working class movement, we would say that Marx discovered the working class as a historical category, that is, a class with definite conditions of historical existence and definite laws of historical development."

To V. I. Lenin a greater destiny has been allotted: he has led the working class, which was theoretically "discovered" by Marx, into the fight. Under his leadership, the working class in one country at least, from being the "lowest" class became the ruling class. His genius has created an international organization of the working class which has set itself the same goal on an international scale.

Although it was not given to V. I. Lenin to "discover" the working class, it was given to the working class to "discover" Lenin himself. During the very earliest manifestations of the approaching proletarian world revolution, the international working class perceived in Lenin its chosen leader.

V. I. Lenin always felt himself merely as the first of the workers whom history had pushed to the position of leadership. Throughout his whole activity it always seemed as if he said: I am only one of the leading working men. It fell to my lot to possess a good education and capacity, my business is to gather all the remaining workers together and lead them to battle.

This fundamental attitude of V. I. Lenin has communicated itself through a thousand invisible threads, — through "wireless telegraphy" — from heart to heart within the widest circles of the non-party workers. The intimate, affectionate, attitude of the widest circles of the non-party working masses towards Vladimir Ilyitch was shown with striking clearness in the year 1918, when wounded by the bullet of the S.R., Comrade Lenin struggled against death. Who does not remember the great flood of resolutions and declarations which poured in at that time from the masses, written by the workers themselves, which bore a quite unique impress of the fullest love, tenderness and adoration in the deepest sense of the words.

The masses of the working class are by no means effusive in the way they accord praise and appreciation. The ordinary worker is generally moderate and reserved in the expression of his feelings, even towards a highly esteemed leader. But in the year 1918, this ordinary worker found words concerning V. I. Lenin which have rendered many resolutions of non-party workers real models of artistic prose.

And we are experiencing the same in greater measure now that Vladimir Ilyitch has closed his eyes for ever. One needs only read the following letter from a working woman over the death of Comrade Lenin:

The unemployed Nikitorova writes:

"Our dear father! You have left your children for ever.

We know that the hour will soon come when from the lands of all the earth, wreaths will pour in to cover your warm grave. And it will not be moistened by the morning dew of summer, but by the tears of your children who have loved you so deeply and who will eternally be devoted to your memory.

Who can doubt that these words express the feeling of the best in the ranks of the working class?

A single tear from such a working woman is the best praise for a leader of the proletariat.

He who has seen the tens and hundreds of thousands of workers waiting in devout silence to enter the state chamber, to pay their last respects to the departed, will never forget this drama, whose magnitude was unsurpassed in the history of the world.

He who knows the attitude of the Russian worker towards Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin, has never doubted that from the mass of non-party workers one united reply would come to the death of the Master. We did not know what character it would take. Now it is quite clear. The non-party workers are streaming in masses to the ranks of the party created by V. I. Lenin.

In Leningrad and Voronezh, in Kiev and Charkow, in Moscow and Ivanovo-Vosnessensk, in the Donetz valley — everywhere the same is happening; baring their heads before the newly made grave of V. I. Lenin, the non-party workers are expressing, without superfluous words, that firm desire to enter the ranks of our Party.

Whole organizations are deciding unitedly to join the Party or "To elect their best and to send them as members into the Party".

That is a manifestation completely without parallel and whose significance can scarcely be overestimated. The Party must study it carefully, learn to understand it thoroughly and to draw all possible practical conclusions from it.

"We will place our power at the disposal of the glorious organization of the R. C. P., whose stability has been shaken by the loss of its Master and Leader". So write the non-party workers of the Ammunition works in Moscow.

At the joint special meeting of the workers of the "Moskust" cast iron worker and the "Moto Maschina" concern on the morning of 23rd January, there were about 400 workers present, 99 of them expressed the desire forthwith to join the Party. Dozens of similar declarations from non-party workers are reaching the Party nuclei of "The Red Leather Worker" Works. "He who is stronger shall join the ranks of the R.C.P. We will do our utmost to send the best into the ranks of the R.C.P."

Such utterances are coming from the circles of non-party workers in the great industrial concerns of Leningrad and other towns.

"The 50 non-party workers here assembled have chosen their 5 best and are sending them to join the ranks of the R.C.P."

Such resolutions have been received by the dozens.

This movement is just beginning. We must understand how to give heed to it and to support it. Our recent Union Party Congress decided to introduce no fewer than 100,000 new party members into our ranks in the course of the next year, consisting exclusively of workers from the workshops. This decision was made before the death of Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin. If this decision were correct and profoundly justified before the 21st January — the day upon which Vladimir Ilyitch closed his eyes for ever — it is now by far more correct and justified.

We do not speak here of the hundreds and thousands of resolutions from non-party workers, which only speak generally of the necessity for strengthening our R.C.P. We are not speaking about those workers who, perhaps under the influence of their feelings, give expression to their trust in our Party; we do not doubt that if one had urged the hundred of thousands of workers who streamed to the lying-in-state in the hall of the Trades Union Building to join the Party, a good half of them would have enthusiastically accepted.

We speak here essentially of those amongst the non-party workers who firmly, and in the strength of their conviction resulting from mature thoughtful consideration, adopted their present attitude towards our Party.

In the events which we are now experiencing, each one of us can see with particular clearness how strong our Party is and how, despite all our weaknesses, it is intimately connected to and grown to the mass of the non-party workers. With anxiety we put the question at our congresses and conferences: How many members have we who are engaged in industry? Is this group not too small? Are we not in danger of separating ourselves from the masses? This anxiety is justified. We would be no disciples of Comrade Lenin if we did not ask ourselves such questions, and if we did not do our utmost at the right time to adopt the necessary measures. The echo, however, which the departure of Vladimir Ilyitch has found amongst hundreds of thousands and millions of the non-party workers in our Union of Republics show that, in the end, the question of how great the groups of those members of our Party are who are immediately engaged in industrial work, is a subordinate one. We always were and will remain the party of the working class, flesh of its flesh. The masses of the

workers recognize and will recognize no other party than that which was created and brought to maturity by Vladimir Ilyitch.

Our Party can do well to pay the closest heed to the conspicuous movement which has set in during the last few days amongst the wide circles of the non-party workers. We must meet this movement with all our power. If we, in the near future, succeed in bringing an entirely new stratum of workers from the industrial concerns into our Party, it will be the best wreath we can lay upon the newly made grave of Vladimir Ilyitch. The new stratum of workers which, in view of the remarkable enthusiasm amongst the non-party proletariat during the last few days, will, after the necessary test, enter our Party, will not be — of that we are convinced — the worst one.

These new strata of what were yesterday non-party workers, will gain through the help of our Party the necessary tempering and Marxist education, and will become a worthy part of the advance — guard in the cause of Lenin. Yesterday we heard accidentally a conversation of two workers:

The first . . . „What will we now do without him (Vladimir Ilyitch)?“

The Second: „Oh, that won't be so very difficult now — But what would we have done had he died three or four years ago?“

In this way simple workers translate into their own language the words of the poet: „Say not with sorrow: they are no longer there, but with thankfulness: they were there.“

The misfortune which has befallen our Party will be felt by the whole working masses of our country as their own misfortune. The best friend of the people is dead. But also through his death he has united anew the ranks of the class of which he was the Standard Bearer.

Nearer and still nearer to the working masses — that is our answer to the enthusiasm which has set in amongst the non-party workers. And only such a policy of our Party is worthy of the name of Vladimir Ilyitch.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Third Convention of the Workers Party of America.

By I. A. Mter.

The third convention of the Workers Party (Communist) took place on December 29, 1923, and was one of the most important in the history of the Communist movement of the United States. The general policies carried out by the Central Executive Committee of the Party were approved, nevertheless the former minority of the Committee, led by Foster and Cannon, representing the „industrials“ in the Party, carried the convention against the „politicals“, led by Pepper and Ruthenberg, and now direct the Party.

Comrade Ruthenberg, executive secretary of the Party, reported that the Party now contains 25,000 members, divided into sixteen Language Federations, in addition to seven language groups not large enough to constitute Federations. The Finnish Federation is the largest, having 7,000 members; then follows the English section with about 2,000 members. Nevertheless, about 50 per cent of the Party membership speaks English, although enrolled in Language branches. The multiplicity of languages is one of the difficult problems that the Party has to deal with and acts as an obstacle to uniform action on the part of the membership as a whole.

There are several issues before the Party at the present time. The attacks on the Communists in the trade unions and on members of the Trade Union Educational League; the expulsions that have taken place; the vicious campaign against the Communists and „reds“ in the organizations, particularly by the reactionary leaders of the United Mine Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers, demand the intensification of Communist work in the unions and better organization of the Left Wing, in order to strengthen the offensive of the progressives and radicals against the reactionaries in the unions. The amalgamation campaign for transforming the craft unions into industrial unions must be continued with energy, until by pressure from below amalgamation really is brought about. This may be a process of years, but it must be pressed.

American imperialism is on a rampage. Mexico, Central and South America, the West Indies, the Philippines, China and even Europe are feeling the heavy golden hand of American capital. The expansion of American militarism is concomitant with the expansion of imperialism. War is bound to come, and the American workers must be put on the alert. The convention decided to widen the campaign against American imperialism and militarism.

In order to get a firm footing in the work shops and to prepare for the coming struggles in the United States, when the capitalist government will make new assaults on the revolutionary movement, the convention decided to form shop nuclei and gradually to put the whole Party on this basis. The difficulty of language and the spy system in the shops are two serious impediments to the transformation. Hence the change will be carried out very slowly and carefully.

The vital questions confronting the convention were the Farmer-Labour Party, more especially the Federated Farmer-Labour Party, which was formed on July 3 last, and within which the Communists play a leading role; and the question of a „third“ bourgeois party. Some comrades had contended that the formation of the Federated Farmer-Labour Party acted as an obstacle to the growth of the farmer-labour movement since the whole movement was stamped as Communist. The Federated Party did not receive all the affiliations that had been hoped, the membership of the organizations actually affiliated to the Federated Party amounting to only 155,000, although several other local parties have endorsed it and are ready to cooperate with it. The Minnesota Farmer Labour Party which sent two United States Senators to Washington, has called a convention to take place in St. Paul on May 30, the Federated Party signing the call for the convention. This convention will probably be attended by delegates representing two or three million organized workers and farmers. In the Minnesota Party are a number of petty-bourgeois elements such as tradesmen, small country bankers, lawyers etc. This convention will be a sign of the revolt of the workers, farmers and some sections of the petty-bourgeoisie against the domination of the capitalist political parties. It will be the first call to action on a mass scale that the Communists have been able to issue, for the Workers Party will be present at the convention, possibly by direct representation, or through the Federated Party of which it is an integral part. Gompers is opposed to this convention, since he recognizes that this is a real revolt, reaching a climax through the militant activity of the Communists. The tactics of the Central Executive Committee of the Workers Party in regard to the Federated Farmer Labour Party were generally approved by the convention.

The moot point was in regard to the „third“ bourgeois party. This is a new question of tactics for the American Party and in some respects for the Communist International. The capitalist political parties of the United States are dominated by two groups: Rockefeller, representing primarily the industrial group, and Morgan, the financial group. In the past few years, the possibility of a clean definition of these two groups has grown smaller. Wall Street dominates big industry and in Wall Street are Rockefeller and Morgan. Morgan is heavily interested in several of the same industries in which the Rockefeller interests have huge investments, such as steel, railways, traction, shipping. Both groups control the raw material of the country. Ford's abortive rebellion against Wall Street was based on his being a manufacturer of finished products therefore he is dependent on Rockefeller and Morgan. Ford has sold out to Coolidge, hence he cannot be regarded as a leader of any rebellious group.

The farmers of the middle west and large sections of the working class still believe that they can secure help from some form of a bourgeois party, not built up on class lines. They are in open rebellion against the big trusts and trust to a good leader to conduct them out of the desert. This leader is La Follette. The oil scandal, which has involved both the Democratic and the Republican party, has led to the demand of the Senate that Secretary of War Denby resign. It also eliminates McAdoo as presidential candidate. By giving a „black eye“ to both parties, it increases the hatred of both parties among the workers and farmers, and enhances the prestige of La Follette.

The backbone of this revolt, which is assuming the form of a third party, consists of the farmers and workers. The petty merchant class is also interested, but it forms the mino-

riety. In other words, the third party movement is composed relatively of the same elements as the class farmer-labour party. The question is: what kind of a program would they fight for?

The farmers and workers have serious grievances against the trusts and the capitalist government. They are expressing them in the demand for the nationalization of the mines and railways, protection of the foreign-born workers, protection of child labor, cheap industrial products for the farmers. More radical groups are demanding a moratorium for the farmers, in view of the fearful plight of the farming class. During the past year, the farmers have formed about 15 per cent of the bankruptcies; there were 300,000 foreclosures; although the planted acreage was reduced 12 per cent, there is a huge surplus of grain, and further reduction is contemplated. Recognition of Soviet Russia is being demanded for ideological and material reasons. How many of these demands will the third party fight for?

La Folette is committed to a large number of them. He represents elements, which, in large part, would accept them. If a program approaching the above one in content is put forward, what shall be the attitude of the Communists? Shall they fight side by side with the third party against the trust-dominated and controlled capitalist parties, or shall they split the ranks of the workers, small and medium farmers and the petty bourgeoisie?

When the thesis was discussed in the former Central Executive Committee last November, the overwhelming majority voted in favor of the former strategy, the vote standing 21 to 3. During the month of November and December, a change of view took place. Some of the CEC members who voted for the proposition, discovered that it is a fallacious policy. They contend that to entertain such a policy denotes merely to strengthen the faith of the masses in petty-bourgeois reformism; that such strategy may be engaged in only in revolutionary situations; and that, as such a situation does not exist in the United States, it would be a serious blunder to advocate it. They declare that the formation of a class farmer-labour party is the only warrant of a safe revolutionary course, not subject to misinterpretation or misdirection.

The majority of the Central Executive Committee maintained that the policy is correct, but for different reasons. The "industrials" see in it a powerful weapon with which to oust Gompers from control of the unions and from continuing his propagation of the idea of "rewarding the friends and punishing the enemies of labour" through the medium of the capitalist parties. The "politicals" declare that rejection of an election campaign in coalition with the third party despite its petty bourgeois ideology and control, means to evade the whole issue. The petty bourgeois party will be formed with us or without us. To support it might result in its victory. Then alone would the workers and farmers realize that petty bourgeois reformism is fruitless. All preaching and education has no effect: the workers, and especially the farmers, must see it in action. The campaign will allow us to enter the third party wherever opportunity presents itself, to form a left wing within it, and split it away from the third party. By ruthless, merciless criticism of the third party, the Communists will unmask its character. Thus, whether the third party is victorious or defeated, out of this campaign will ultimately come greater class-consciousness of the workers and the farmers.

The minority has not learned the lesson of the Bulgarian election defeat, when the Communists did not understand the policy of a coalition with the small peasants who were dominated by the big peasants; nor of the British Communists in endeavoring to get into the Labour Party, which is made up primarily of workers with a minority of petty bourgeois liberals. It would evade the struggle, which is along a very thorny path.

Unquestionably, there are serious dangers involved in this policy. To carry it out successfully, the Party members must observe strict discipline. Above all, they must understand the policy and be able to carry in out like Communists. They must understand that it is a strategy and not an end in itself. They must recognize that it is an unmasking policy and a mobilization of the workers and farmers for action. Though supporting the third party, they must be able to criticize it pitilessly. This is a strategy that the Parties of Europe and America are just learning to apply. It is a hard course, it will involve many blunders — but that is the path of the Revolution.

Tactics within the convention led to a coalition of the industrials and the opponents of the third party policy. The new Central Executive Committee is led by the industrials. There is no question, however, that cooperation of the industrials and the politicals, which led to the elaboration of the successful trade union and political policies during the past year, will bring about a realignment in the new CEC, under the leadership, however, of the industrials.

BOOK REVIEWS

Philips Price: „Germany in Transition“.*)

By E. Varga.

Philips Price is one of the very rare English intellectuals, who have joined the Communist Party. As correspondent for the „Daily Herald“, he lived since the armistice until the end of 1923 in Germany, and in this way had the opportunity of studying at first hand the development of the social and political situation there.

His book contains the political history of Germany from the end of the War to the setting up of the Seeckt-dictatorship. The central-point of his work concerns the role played by the Social-Democratic Party during this period. He recognizes most clearly how the Social-Democratic Party, fearful of the Revolution, has restored step by step to the bourgeoisie the power which, with the collapse of the War, had fallen into its hands without any efforts on its part and almost against its wil. In particular, he recognizes most clearly how the traditional attitude of the Social Democracy as a party of the highly skilled workers, with its hostility and its disregard of the movement of the agricultural workers, has made possible the successive revival of the power of the Junkers. In the last chapter: „German Socialism and the Interpretation of the Teachings of Marx“, the writer seeks to point out the ideological root of the treachery of Social Democracy, and the opportunistic explanation of Marxism. The book gives in compressed brevity (260 pages) a fairly complete picture of the events in Germany in the five years after the war, and in its style is adapted before all to the needs of the English reader. For England especially it is a most opportune book. For the situation in England at the present time is very similar to the situation in Germany in 1918. In England too a so-called Labour Party is ruling, but the social bases of society remain as undisturbed as they were in Germany when the Social Democrats were in Office. The hopes of the English working class of improving its position, through a Labour government are as great as were those of the German workers regarding Social Democracy. In England too they will not fail to be disappointed. Price's book is well suited to prepare the English working class for this disappointment, as well as to make clear to it that the dashing of its hopes will not be the result of mere chance. It does not depend on the good or bad will of the leaders of Social Democracy and of the Labour Party, — they may be honest men personally and yet betray the cause of the working class — but on the system itself. Every attempt to improve radically the situation of the working class through the bourgeois state apparatus must fail, because this apparatus, built as it is, can only serve the bourgeoisie. By means of the example of Germany, Philips Price's book furnishes proof of the correctness of Lenin's theory of the State, as set forth in „The State and Revolution“. The book may serve as a good primer for the English proletariat in order to learn through the German example the future development of the political conditions in England, and the truth of the conception of the State held by Marx and Lenin.

The leaders of the British Labour Party appear to have rightly estimated the importance of this book by preserving silence over it. We, at least, have not up to now seen any review of the book by Price in the press of the Labour Party so far as the latter has been accessible to us. It is all the more necessary therefore that our English comrades do everything possible, so that the book shall reach ever wider circles of the English proletariat.

*) 1923. London, The Labour Publishing Company.