



QUESTIONS & ANSWERS ON COMMUNISM

By J. R. CAMPBELL

6^{D.}

H

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS ON COMMUNISM

By

J. R. CAMPBELL

LONDON :

LAWRENCE & WISHART

1938

Published by
LAWRENCE AND WISHART, LTD.
2, Parton Street, London, W.C.1.
28/3/38.

Printed at the
FARLEIGH PRESS,
17-29, Cayton Street,
E.C.1,

PREFACE

THERE is unanimous agreement among all readers of the "Daily Worker," that J. R. Campbell's daily feature, "Answers to Questions," is one of the most effective pieces of political propaganda that any working-class paper has ever introduced.

I know that it is becoming a growing habit for many readers to turn immediately to Page Two so that they can see "what Johnny has to say to-day."

Why is it this feature has become so popular? Simply because of the character of the times we live in. There are so many new questions and problems arising, so many tactical issues coming to the front, so many difficulties, doubts and confusion, that authoritative answers and explanations by one of the foremost Marxist and Communist leaders in Britain are bound to be eagerly read and discussed.

The replies of J. R. Campbell are reaching out to a far wider circle of people than those who are already readers of the "Daily Worker." They are being discussed by educational classes, factory and trade union discussions, and are helping in a new and convincing way to bring clarity, political conviction and knowledge to thousands of people who thus feel all the better equipped to carry on the active struggle against poverty, reaction and war. At the same time as revolutionary consciousness and understanding is being developed, that leads to a more effective fight being waged against capitalism as a whole and its replacement by Socialism.

The success of Comrade Campbell's replies is that they are based on Marxism, not as a dogma, but as a guide to asking in the many-sided circumstances of the present situation. They recognise no short cuts, no glib use of revolutionary phrases that have no living relation to the current conditions that

prevail. They are completely different from that spurious type of education which settles everything to the satisfaction of a pedantic lecturer who sees nothing, only the four walls of a class room, and occasionally a copy of one of our so-called educational periodicals.

Comrade Campbell takes every factor and relation of forces into account, bases his replies on the realities of the situation, what has to be done and how it should be done, and in this way he is able to give the answer to a question, that becomes also an inspiration to fight the class enemy and achieve the cause we all have at heart.

Everybody who reads this book will gain much from it. They will be able to turn to it time and time again. The simplicity of expression, the wealth of fact and argument, the pawky humour and the hard hitting punch make this book of Johnny Campbell's one of the most important contributions the "Daily Worker" has made towards achieving informed political knowledge, striving for unity and the wider People's Front, and giving that indispensable living Marxist education without which no advance to Socialism is possible.

We hope every reader will make it a special point to get a mass sale for this invaluable book, for in doing so, they are helping forward, in the conditions of our time, to widen the application of a very old slogan, about which quite insufficient is heard to-day. That slogan is: "Agitate, Educate, Organise." At the same time we hope readers will not forget their obligations to the "Daily Worker" which has made this book possible and to show their appreciation of it by securing new readers, who will be able day by day not only to read the best informed newspaper in the country, but also the further replies of J. R. Campbell to the questions of its readers.

HARRY POLLITT.

CONTENTS

BRITAIN

	<i>Page</i>
1. Wages and Prices	7
2. Do the Rich Keep Us?	9
3. Workers and Empire	12
4. Why Should Communist Party Not Dissolve? ..	14
5. Communist Affiliation	17
6. The People's Front	20
7. The Block Vote in the Unions	23
8. The Time Is Now	25
9. Query on Dictatorship	28

PEACE AND WAR

	<i>Page</i>
1. Why Capitalism Cannot Make Peace	31
2. Is War Inevitable?	33
3. Belgium, 1914—China, 1937	36
4. Soviet Peace Policy	39
5. Alliances and Peace	42
6. In War Against Fascism	45
7. Fascism and Colonies	47
8. Soviet Trade With Germany	50
9. Why Vote Against Arms Plan?	53

SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

	<i>Page</i>
1. The Dictatorship of the Workers	55
2. What Is State Capitalism?	58
3. About A Ruling Class	61
4. This Time the "Herald"	64
5. Bedaux and Stakhanov	66
6. Once More the "Daily Herald"	69
7. About Adulation	72
8. Good-bye the "Herald"	75
9. Contradictions in Socialist Society	78
10. The State	81
11. Trade Unions Under Socialism	84
12. The Soviet Trials	87
13. The Soviet Union	90
14. Soviet Russia and Spain	92

CONTENTS

1. Do the Rich Keep Us?	11
2. Workers and Unions	12
3. Why Should Communist Party Not Dissolve?	14
4. Communist Activities	17
5. The People's Front	20
6. The Black Vote in the Election	23
7. The Issue is Now	25
8. Union or Disunion	28

THE NEW FRONT

9. Why Capitalism Cannot Make Progress	31
10. Is War Inevitable?	33
11. The Russian 1917-1918	36
12. Soviet Peace Policy	39
13. Unions and Progress	42
14. War Against Fascism and Communism	45
15. The New Front	48
16. Why Vote Against Army Bill	51

THE NEW FRONT

17. The Disfranchisement of the Worker	53
18. Workers' Basic Organization	56
19. Against A Russian China	59
20. The New Front	62
21. Workers' and Unions	65
22. Once More the "Party Method"	68
23. About Activities	71
24. Disfranchisement of the Worker	74
25. Continued Disfranchisement of the Worker	77
26. The State of Affairs	80
27. From Unions to Party	83
28. The Soviet Trials	86
29. The Soviet Union	89
30. Soviet Russia and Spain	92

WAGES AND PRICES

"Is it not a fact that under the capitalist system when concessions are granted to the workers in the form of increased wages, that they are taken off them again in the rise in prices which usually follows?"—P. McM. (Belfast).

IT is not true that the capitalist class can offset wage increases by increasing prices.

Even if it were true it would not be an argument against increased wages. For the working class at the most consumes about one-third of the wealth produced in society. The rest is consumed (i) by intermediate sections of the population, and (ii) by the capitalist class in the form of (a) luxury expenditure, and (b) capital goods, as for example, when an engineering firm buys iron and steel or a textile mill buys machinery.

So even if the cost of increased wages could be put on to prices, the workers would still be better off because the greater part of the increase would fall on the shoulders of other sections of society.

It does not follow that the capitalist class can always increase prices to recoup themselves for having to pay increased wages.

MILK OR BUS

Suppose, for example, the milk roundsmen in the London combines get an increase in wages, it will be by no means easy for the combines to increase the price of milk, for they are in competition with the Co-operatives and the small distributors. The combine would have to pay the increase (a) out of its high profits, or (b) by cutting down its excessive advertising and canvassing costs.

Or take a bus company. In many cases that company is in competition with the railways, it is under the pressure of local public opinion, and it cannot always charge increased fares on account of paying increased wages.

It would be more true to say that increased prices give rise to increased wages than the reverse. When the capitalist system begins to climb out of a slump prices are rising, and the upward movement is generally under way before the workers begin to demand increased wages.

BOOM AND SLUMP

Such increased wages may be followed by still further increases in prices, which give the impression that the increased wages have *caused* the increased prices. In point of fact, the greater part of the increase in price would probably have taken place even if there had been no increase in wages.

If the workers, in a period of boom, refrained from fighting for increased wages, it would mean that the purchasing power of their wages would be steadily reduced by the rising cost of living.

This would not prevent the employers from seeking to reduce wages when the slump came round.

The common-sense policy is for the workers to push wages as high as possible during the boom, to build up powerful trade union organisation to defend their standards, and to struggle in the ensuing slump to defend the gains achieved during the boom.

MINERS' WAGES

There is, however, one recent apparent exception to the general principle here outlined—namely, the

rise in miners' wages at the beginning of 1936 leading to an increase in the price of coal.

Miners' wages were undoubtedly very low, and the Government used its influence to make public utilities like gas and electricity works and great coal-users like the big steel firms pay more for their coal. The price of coal was also increased to the domestic consumer.

There is good reason for believing, however, that the increased prices obtained by Government intervention simply anticipated by a few months a rise in price that would have taken place through the operation of ordinary market conditions.

The fact that the capitalists cannot fix prices arbitrarily was shown when the export districts (South Wales, Durham and Scotland) were unable to give the same increases as districts producing for the inland market because the export districts were unable to raise their prices.

Even in this apparent exception it is evident that the working class did not pay for all the increased wages, a considerable portion being borne by the other coal consumers.

* * *

DO THE RICH KEEP US ?

"What is the best way of countering the argument that 'the expenditure of the rich gives rise to employment'?"

"I know one can advance the explanation that under production for use there will be more and better employment, but this takes time and not every listener has the patience or willingness to

understand. Is there not a shorter, more direct answer?

"You will no doubt appreciate that the question has a double implication: (a) in regard to home trade, and (b) in regard to the spending of the income from foreign investments."—J. F. D. D. (Hampstead).

IF the expenditure of the rich gives rise to employment, then we should imprison them whenever an economic crisis takes place, because on the basis of this argument it is their refusal to spend that is throwing millions out of work.

The fact is, the unemployed crises exist independent of the will of the rich, who quite naturally would like to keep all the workers employed, creating profits for their masters.

If the rich could find ways and means of employing at a profit the one and three-quarter million unemployed that now exist in the midst of the boom, they would do so most willingly.

Having made that clear, we should point out that the existing expenditure of the rich is only possible in consequence of the previous exploitation of the workers.

Apart from the £200 million that the capitalist class derive annually from their foreign investments, they extract from the British worker about £340 million per annum in rent and £900 million in profit.

Naturally they spend these sums on goods for their own immediate use and on reinvestment in industry. The latter will in part express itself in demands for capital goods, i.e., the extension of factories and the manufacture of more labour saving machinery.

Naturally, workers find employment in making goods for the personal use of the rich and in extending the industries owned by the rich.

A socialist system would stop this flow of rent, interest and profit of the rich. A portion of this sum would go to wages enabling the worker to buy more for his own use, a portion would be used in extending industry, and a portion in extending the social services, and the workers would be making goods for themselves or for the extension of the industries which they owned. They would work entirely for themselves and not as to-day (1) partly for themselves and (2) partly for the capitalists.

Besides, this Socialist system would eliminate the contradictions of the capitalist system and would plan in such a way that unemployment could be abolished.

It is true that the capitalist class spend part of their income from foreign investments in this country and that workers make the goods they demand.

But if the workers got rid of the capitalist and stopped themselves from being robbed, they would, as the above quoted figures show, derive much greater benefit than they do by sharing to a small extent in the fruits of capitalist robbery in other lands.

Besides, Socialism does not only mean a better distribution of existing wealth, but the enormously increased production of wealth.

* * *

“Why, when the Fascists are helping each other as, for example, Italy and Germany helping Franco, does not the Soviet Union renounce non-

intervention and openly assist the Spanish Government?"—E. J. K. (Twickenham).

THE Soviet Union declared in October, 1936, that it is only bound by the non-intervention agreement to the same extent as the other powers. It had Germany in mind in making this declaration. Since October, 1936, the Soviet Union has been helping Spain in every possible way. It remains on the non-intervention committee to prevent as far as possible that Committee adopting policies hostile to the Spanish Government and to world peace.

Our correspondent's question is therefore based on a complete misapprehension of what the Soviet Union is doing.

* * *

WORKERS AND EMPIRE

"Are Communists for the break-up of the British Empire? If so, how could we in this tiny island feed ourselves? If India were to break away, would she not be immediately conquered by Japan?"—E. J. (Leeds).

COMMUNISTS are for giving the Colonies the right of self-determination, which includes the right to break away from the British Empire. This would certainly deprive the British ruling class of the right to rob the people of the Colonies.

It would not deprive the British workers' government of the possibility of obtaining colonial foodstuffs, and raw materials in exchange for British manufactured products.

A free India would be in need of assistance for the industrialisation which is necessary to make it

a modern progressive country, and an arrangement could be made with it whereby Socialist industry in Britain would help in this industrialisation, receiving in exchange food and raw materials.

A Socialist Britain could unite with Socialist Russia in guaranteeing the independence of India, thus protecting it from Japanese aggression.

Britain's dependence on foreign foodstuffs has been quite unnecessarily accentuated by Imperialist development. Because Britain was the centre of a world empire it paid the dominant class in Britain to let British agriculture down and to develop the country as "the workshop of the world."

British land is of excellent quality and, given the abolition of parasitic landlordism, there is nothing to prevent the raising in Britain of a substantial amount of the foodstuffs now being brought from abroad. The possession of an Empire has been more of a disaster than an advantage to British agriculture.

While it is possible to argue that a capitalist country with an Empire has an advantage over a capitalist country which has no Empire, (an advantage that accrues mainly to the capitalist class), it is not true that it would have an advantage over a Socialist country which had freed the colonial peoples and was co-operating with them on a basis of equality.

For we have got to remember the "overheads of Empire," i.e., the maintenance of a crushing burden of militarism, the constant risks of war, the training of a reactionary colonial bureaucracy who on their return to Britain infect the capitalist democratic institutions of this country.

The quarrels of the ruling classes of the world over the division of colonies threaten to produce a series of increasingly devastating world wars, unless we get rid of capitalism and Empires altogether.

All the alleged advantages of Empire—the obtaining of tropical foodstuffs for our people and raw materials for our industries—could be got in the ordinary way of exchange between this country and the former colonies.

It would be possible at a certain stage of Socialist development to have, instead of a series of national plans, a co-ordinated Socialist plan covering a number of States, including former colonies.

In short, the British people can get what it needs for its sustenance by means of economic co-operation, without being under the necessity of subjecting and robbing other peoples.

* * *

WHY SHOULD COMMUNIST PARTY NOT DISSOLVE

“If the Communist Party wants unity, would it not be better for it to dissolve itself? Those who are members of the Communist Party at present could then join the Labour Party and work as individuals. In this way unity would be achieved.”

BUT would it? What do we mean by unity? Do we mean by unity that all workers should be on the same level of political development; that they should all share the same fundamental outlook on the great social questions of the day?

However desirable that state of affairs might be, it does not exist at the present time. The workers

are at different stages of political development. They are organised in different Parties.

Unity can only mean that the different working-class organisations shall seek to attain common agreement on immediate questions, such as how to struggle against the increased cost of living; how to maintain peace; how to secure the early defeat of the National Government. What is wanted is **UNITY IN ACTION** on these immediate issues.

HAS SET THE PACE

Would the dissolution of the Communist Party help forward this unity in action? If there had been no Communist Party in 1936, would there have been any campaign on Spain? Would there be a British Battalion of the International Brigade? Would there have been a great Hunger March last year? Would there have been the growth of progressive movements inside the Unions?

There would not.

It is because there is a Communist Party that set the pace on these questions that it is possible to get the united action of all workers at the present day.

We all know that individual workers do good Socialist work inside the Labour Party. They are helped, however, by the existence of a Party which runs a daily newspaper; which publishes the classics of Socialism; which conducts a widespread Socialist campaign; whose Socialist pamphlets circulate to a much greater extent than the pamphlets of the Labour Party.

Dissolve the Communist Party, and this powerful influence amongst the workers would cease and the

task of the militant Socialists inside the Labour Party would be harder.

And the dissolution of the Communist Party would not bring unity of action nearer. It would strengthen those who have been holding the Labour Party back from action.

It would strengthen those to whom Eden appealed when, in his speech on Friday, he declared that he hoped that unity between Government and Opposition on the Arms question would be followed by unity on other questions. It would mean the victory, not of unity in action, but of co-operation with the National Government.

The Communist Party of Great Britain is a force for working-class unity. So are its brother organisations. It was the Communist Party in France and Spain which initiated the policy of the People's Front, barring the way to Fascism.

Without the aid of the Soviet Union there would be no Spanish democracy in existence to-day. Without the Soviet Union there would be no living demonstration in the world to-day of the superiority of Socialism over capitalism.

SHOCK TROOPS

Without the British Communist Party there would be no Socialist propaganda over large areas in present-day Britain. Why should a growing section of the great world army of Communism—the shock troop of the working class—dissolve at the moment when its policy is registering victory?

The choice is, therefore, between sham unity, based on the dissolution of the powerful, militant Socialist force, represented by the Communist Party

of Great Britain—a sham unity that leads to a rapprochement with the National Government—and the real unity, represented by the admission of this militant force into the Labour Party, in order that a joint struggle shall be waged against the whole policy of the National Government.

In short, not unity in stagnation, but unity in action, is the need of the day.

* * *

COMMUNIST AFFILIATION

“What guarantee has the Communist Party if it gets affiliation to the Labour Party its representative in Parliament will not, as a member of the Labour Party, be forced to vote for reactionary measures; for example, in favour of the Government’s Arms Programme?”—R. T. (London, S.E.).

THE Communist Party cannot have absolute guarantees as to the future behaviour of the Labour Party in Parliament or elsewhere.

What it does say is that the forces within the Labour Party, which are fighting for a vigorous working-class policy, are growing; that the United Front policy of the Communist Party is strengthening these forces; that the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party would be a striking victory for the militant forces and would create the conditions for a further successful struggle against imperialist tendencies within the Labour Party.

The Communist Party’s desire for affiliation to the Labour Party is not based upon the conception that the Labour Party is a perfect Party. It is based

on the fact that working-class united action on the basis of an immediate programme is absolutely necessary if peace is to be maintained and democracy safeguarded, and the only reasonable form of the United Front (in present British circumstances) is Communist affiliation to the Labour Party.

The Communist Party cannot, therefore, refrain from struggling for working-class unity until it gets guarantees that the realisation of unity will create no problems for the Communist Party. Guarantees such as that desired by our correspondent, namely, that the Labour Party will not vote for imperialist projects, nor seek to force the Communist Party, as an affiliated body, to do so, can only be created in the course of the struggle itself.

The Communist Party can only, at the present stage, declare:—

1. That it can wholeheartedly support the struggle inside and outside Parliament—for the realisation of Labour's Short Term Programme.
2. That it desires affiliation to the Labour Party on the same terms as other affiliated organisations.
3. That it is prepared to discuss all outstanding questions with the Executive of the Labour Party or anyone acting on its behalf.

* * *

“What ground is there for the statement of J. R. C., in reply to a question on October 29, that the Labour Party Short-Term Programme can be realised within the framework of Parliament? Does this not assume that the Labour Party has ceased to be a Reformist Party, and is capable of standing up to capitalism? Does this not create illusions as to the character of the Labour Party?”

OUR reply did not say that the Labour Party will inevitably realise its programme through Parliament. Neither did it state that the Labour leadership will necessarily put up a vigorous fight for that programme. What it did say was that the programme could be realised through Parliament, and any capitalist resistance broken, if the united working-class movement and the progressive sections of the middle class backed up the Parliamentary fight of the Labour Party.

We cannot guarantee beforehand that the Labour Party leadership will fight, or that the popular masses will support them.

Our whole United Front policy, however, helps to bring to the front a Labour leadership that will fight and helps to organise the popular masses to support them in the fight.

In this we avoid the mechanical sectarian error: (1) That nothing can be gained through Parliament; and (2) the equally dangerous reformist error that because certain reforms can be forced through Parliament, this is a guarantee that society can be peacefully transformed into Socialism by the same methods.

If we had said that under no circumstances can Labour's Immediate Programme be realised through Parliament, we would have been guilty of the first error. If we had said that Socialism could be realised through Parliament, we would be guilty of the second.

Perhaps our correspondent is mistaken as to the content and implications of the Immediate Programme, which is one for immediate and

valuable reforms, and not for the revolutionary transformation of society. Such a programme can be realised by Parliamentary action, backed by the mass movement.

* * *

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

"Did the Communist Party oppose class collaboration persistently until the creation of the Popular Front movement? If so, was the Communist International responsible for the change-over in policy?"—"PAT" (Darlington), and a similar question from R. J. R. (London).

THE Communist Party persistently opposed co-operation with the capitalist class and does so still. The Popular Front does not imply co-operation with the capitalist class.

Class co-operation in Britain would imply co-operation with the National Government—the political expression of big business in Britain.

It would imply the dampening down of the strike movements.

The Communist Party is the most resolute opponent of both these policies.

A necessary condition of the Popular Front is the United Front of the working class, the object of which is precisely to break down the existing class co-operation in relation to the support of the Government's foreign policy (Non-Intervention and Arms Plan) and in relation to the policy of "peace in industry."

POPULAR FRONT AND "MIDDLE CLASS"

The Popular Front is an alliance of the united working class with the intermediate sections of the

population who are neither capitalists nor proletarians, in the strict sense of the words, i.e., the administrative personnel of industry, the professions (doctors, lawyers, etc.), the small proprietors—in a word, all those who are usually embraced in the term “middle class” (a term that, while popular, is scientifically inexact because the intermediate sections are not a social class in the strict sense of the term).

The Popular Front does not mean that the demands of the united front for shorter hours, holidays with pay, higher wages, the defence of democracy and peace, are given up, but that added to these are the specific demands of the middle class.

The demands of the Popular Front do not imply co-operation with monopoly capitalism. On the contrary, they can only be realised at the expense of the monopoly capitalists.

DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS ARE THREATENED

Capitalism is at the present moment attacking not only the standard of life of the workers, but of all those intermediate sections.

Its war preparations threaten the standard of life of all. The middle class, no less than the workers, is threatened with physical destruction in war. Its democratic rights are threatened by the growth of Fascist tendencies in the capitalist class. The Popular Front is, therefore, an elementary measure of self-preservation against capitalist attacks.

The programme of the Popular Front will naturally vary in different countries. It is not a programme for the complete Socialist transformation of society, but it may include measures, such

as the nationalisation of the arms industry, which are an encroachment on the economic privileges of a section of the monopoly capitalists.

The immediate aim of a Popular Front in Britain would be to replace the present reactionary Government by one which would improve conditions all round, and take a firm stand for peace.

The fight for such a Government is not an alternative to the class struggle. It is the effective waging of the class struggle on the issue of the day—the defence of democracy and peace, and the struggle for an all-round improvement of conditions.

The Popular Front is not a barrier to the industrial struggle of the workers. The fact that the French workers were allied with the middle class enabled them to bring greater pressure on monopoly capitalism.

Indeed, the Popular Front, by isolating the monopoly capitalists, weakens their resistance to the demands of the workers in industrial struggles.

The immediate programme of a Popular Front is not its programme for all time. In the process of struggling to defend peace and democracy, the rôle of monopoly capitalism, as the enemy of these things, can be made clear, and the movement raised to a higher level.

THE ONLY WAY FORWARD

The middle class who enter the Popular Front as fighters for peace and democracy within the capitalist system can have their outlook transformed in the course of the struggle, so that they fight alongside the workers for the Socialist transformation of society.

The Popular Front policy is therefore not the abandonment of the ultimate aim of the Socialist movement. On the contrary, without the Popular Front reaction would advance to the destruction of the working-class movement, and postpone for a long time the possibilities of the Socialist transformation. The Popular Front is in present circumstances the only way forward.

Communism has always urged the working class to seek allies in its struggle against capitalism. A policy of the "working class alone" is not Communism but sectarianism, which is harmful at all times and is sheer political lunacy to-day.

* * *

THE BLOCK VOTE IN THE UNIONS

"Why is the block vote undemocratic?"— G. H.
(London).

THE block vote is simply the arrangement by which union delegates at the Trades Union Congress or the Labour Party vote on the various issues that arise in accordance with their affiliated membership. There is therefore nothing inherently undemocratic about the block vote.

But undemocratic practices can grow up in connection with it.

For example, a large union delegation may cast hundreds of thousands of votes on questions on which their membership has not been consulted.

Take for example the vote at the Labour Party Conference on the Executive Committee's recom-

mendation that in future the representatives of the Divisional Labour Parties shall be allowed to elect their own representatives on to the Executive instead of being elected by the whole Conference—consisting of trade union delegates and Divisional Labour Party delegates—as was previously the case.

Most Divisional Labour Parties had discussed this recommendation and were in favour of it. But these delegates saw large unions casting their entire vote against the recommendation, although they knew that such unions had never consulted their members on the question.

Another reason for hostility to the block vote is that as operated by some unions it suppresses minority opinion in the ranks of a delegation.

The way that some unions vote is as follows:—

The union is affiliated on, say, 300,000 members, and has 40 delegates. A question arises as to how the delegation shall vote on a particular resolution. Twenty-one delegates are for the resolution and 19 are against. Yet the entire vote of the delegation is cast for the resolution.

The minority is not represented at all in the voting in Conference.

What is the remedy for this state of affairs? It is for union conferences to give their delegation a mandate on some of the main questions that are likely to arise at the Labour Party Conference or the T.U.C. As the agenda of union conferences are submitted to the branches or district committees beforehand, the decisions of such conferences on big issues usually arise from the mandates given to the delegates, and the union delegation can vote on the

basis of the opinion of the members having been ascertained.

But questions often arise on which the opinion of the rank and file has not been obtained. Here the practice which obtains in unions like the Amalgamated Engineering Union is valuable. Each delegate carries his proportion of the total vote, and when there is a division of opinion in a delegation, a "free vote" is often decided upon, i.e., each delegate casts his proportion of the votes in accordance with his opinion. Thus minority opinion finds expression in the vote, and a fair reflection of the prevailing opinion among the delegations can be obtained.

These changes would remove some of the objections to the block vote.

There can be no question of abolishing the block vote in the sense of allowing each delegate to a Trades Union Congress or Labour Party Conference to vote as one, irrespective of the numbers he represents. The unions should have the right to vote in accordance with their affiliated membership. The rank and file must insist, however, that the block vote procedure is such that it really reflects rank-and-file opinion.

THE TIME IS NOW

"A sympathiser gives as his reasons for not joining the Communist Party that he can carry on work on behalf of the C.P. without being a member. . . . He further says that as the majority of the workers still support the Labour Party, the time for joining the Communist Party is inopportune."—C. H. W. (Bristol).

WE will not spend time on the last reason given, except to say that if people had found it inopportune to join the Labour Party until that Party had won a majority of the working class there would never have been a Labour Party.

Our correspondent's friend sympathises with the Communist Party, i.e., he approves of the immediate policy the Party is putting forward; supports its struggle for the United Front and the Popular Front, approves of its revolutionary aims.

But one of the fundamental principles of Communism is that a revolutionary political party, comprising the best members of the working class, is necessary in order to lead the working class forward.

There are still many obstacles to working-class unity in the trade unions, the factories and in the Labour Party. These obstacles will not be easily cleared away. The organised efforts of the most active and advanced workers is necessary and the Party is needed to organise that effort.

DAYS OF RAPID CHANGES

We are living in days of rapid political changes, as can be seen from the situation in France at this moment.

It is essential that the French working class should react to the new situation quickly. This it will best be able to do if in every factory and working-class district there are strong sections of the Communist Party putting forward an immediate and practical policy.

The aims of the Communist Party, which reflect the fundamental aims of the working class, can be

realised most speedily when the Communist Party is strong. To refuse to join the Communist Party while sympathising with its aims is to weaken the struggle of the working class.

If anyone said, "I sympathise with the principles of trade unionism, but I believe that I can do better work by remaining outside of the union," he would be laughed out of court.

Imagine a worker in a factory saying, "There is a lot of non-unionism here. I will propagate the virtues of trade unionism while making it clear to the non-unionists that I am not myself a trade unionist." How many recruits for trade unionism would be made on that basis?

THE REAL SYMPATHY

The argument that there is a great deal of prejudice against the Communists and therefore a declared non-Communist can best convince the prejudiced is fallacious.

Prejudiced people would quite naturally ask, "If Communist policy is all you say it is, why are you yourself not a member of the Communist Party?"

The argument that non-Communists can sometimes get an item of Communist policy carried in mass organisations which would turn down the same proposition if it was put forward by a known Communist is beside the point.

The working class is not going to be led forward by wangling resolutions through mass organisations, but by being convinced by straightforward methods of the correctness of a given policy.

Working-class prejudice against Communists and their policy will not be broken down by the activities

of sympathisers, but by the activity of the Communist Party, winning the confidence of the workers, and showing them on the basis of their experiences the correctness of Communist policy.

A man was one day talking to a Quaker about his sympathy for a hard case. "How much is thy sympathy worth?" asked the Quaker.

A similar question might be put to sympathisers of the Communist Party. "Does not your sympathy extend to joining the Party and increasing its influence?"

* * *

QUERY ON DICTATORSHIP

"The argument about the dictatorship of the proletariat contained in the Communist Party's Manifesto issued after the Bournemouth Conference will be unconvincing to the central section of the Labour Party.

"Merely to say that the dictatorship is not on the order of the day is not enough. They will reply, 'What will happen when the Communist Party thinks that it is on the order of the day?'"

"We must point out to them that we are willing to fight for the Labour Party going into power. We believe that they will meet with a type of opposition that they do not expect. The C.P.G.B. is prepared to meet that opposition. If, however, the Labour Party dreams (i.e., of no capitalist resistance—J.R.C.) were to be satisfied, no one would be more pleased than the C.P.G.B."

WE would not put the issue quite as our comrade states it.

The Communist Party desires to affiliate to the

Labour Party because it wants a united struggle of the working class on wages and conditions, against the high cost of living, for the maintenance of peace and democracy. The best form of this unity on the political field is, the Communist Party believes, its affiliation to the Labour Party, on the same terms as any other affiliated organisation.

The Labour Party leadership, finding it difficult to dispute that unity on these immediate questions is desirable, tries to argue that it is nevertheless impossible because the Communists believe in dictatorship, while the Labour Party believes in Parliamentary democracy.

To this the Communists answer that it is their policy to defend Parliamentary democracy from the attacks of Fascism and reaction; this is the question of the moment, and on it there is no division between the Labour Party and the Communists.

The Labour leaders try to represent the position as if the Communists were coming into the Labour Party purely with the object of getting it to scrap its existing policy and adopt a Communist policy, in short, that affiliation is merely to give the Communists another platform from which to preach Communist doctrine.

This is untrue. The aim of the Communists is to come into the Labour Party to help in the organisation of a united struggle against the class enemy, to popularise the Short Term Programme of the Labour Party, to organise a struggle to impose some of the items of this programme upon the National Government, with a view to securing the early defeat of this Government.

In short, the issue is not to get the Labour Party to scrap its Short Term Programme for a more revolutionary one, but to organise the masses to fight for this programme.

The Communist Party does support a Labour Government not on the ground that such a Government would encounter the resistance of the capitalist class, and that, therefore, the issue of the dictatorship of the working class must immediately arise.

On the contrary, the Communist Party believes that it is possible for a Government, which has behind it the power of the organised working class, and of wide sections of democratic opinion, to break the resistance of the capitalists and realise the bulk of the Short-Term Programme through Parliament.

Our Party also believes that it will be possible for such a Government to break with the pro-Fascist policy of the National Government and pursue a policy of co-operation with France and the Soviet Union that will lead to the strengthening of the League and the holding of Fascist aggression in check.

But we say that this does not mean that the transition to Socialism can be effected without the forcible resistance of the capitalist class being encountered.

The Labour Party has a right to demand that if the Communist Party comes into its ranks, it comes in to aid in the attainment of the immediate aims of the Labour Party. This assurance the Communists are prepared to give.

But with the events in Spain before our eyes we cannot give certificates of good behaviour to the

British capitalist class and declare, as Communists, that we believe the British ruling class will allow the transition to Socialism to take place peacefully.

We should not, however, let our differing opinions on that divide us in the immediate struggle.

Start the united struggle for the Short-Term Programme, pursue it seriously, and wholeheartedly, and then we shall see.

* * *

WHY CAPITALISM CANNOT MAKE PEACE

"Is a stabilised capitalism on a world scale—a capitalist world state—an impossibility? Could there be a single world trust which would eliminate war? Why don't the capitalists unite in this way, menaced as they are by Socialism?"—M. D. (Mile End).

SOME have regarded a world State as a logical development of capitalism in its present stage of monopoly. They can see the growth of monopoly going on in the form of hitherto independent firms merging into powerful combines both on a national and international scale. Will this development not go on until the economic basis has been laid for a world State?

They forget that the development of monopoly is accompanied and must be accompanied by a growth of antagonism between the various monopolist groups who are struggling for outlets for their capital, cheap sources of raw materials—in short,

the possibilities of extra profit obtained through their monopoly of territories and raw materials.

The development towards a world State thus expresses itself in struggle between the great imperialist States. While it is possible in theory to envisage one State conquering all the rest and imposing its domination throughout the world, in actual practice this would involve such prolonged upheavals and suffering that long before this "goal" can be reached the masses of the people will seek to escape from this gruesome perspective by overthrowing their own imperialist rulers.

Those capitalists like the British who have a large colonial Empire derive an advantage compared with capitalists who have no such Empire, for they are able to exploit not only their own people, but the hundreds of millions of people in the colonies. In time of economic crisis they can pass the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the colonial people.

The law of capitalism is that each monopoly group must strive for the maximum possible profit. This prevents the British capitalists from sharing out with their rivals.

One of the basic laws of capitalism, a law that reaches its sharpest expression in the present period of monopoly, is the law of uneven development.

The various capitalist monopolies; the capitalist industry of different countries develop at different rates.

Thus, for example, in 1892 Germany produced 4,200,000 tons of pig-iron and Britain 6,000,000 tons. In 1912 Germany produced 17,600,000 tons

and Britain 9,000,000 tons. This was an indication of the fact that German industry was developing at a relatively greater rate than the British.

Suppose it were possible—which it is not—to divide up the colonies and markets of the world between the various capitalist States on the basis of their existing economic and political strength, in a few years the relative strength of the various countries would be completely changed and a new struggle for the division of colonies and markets would commence.

It is this law of uneven development which makes firm combinations between imperialists impossible. Thus Italy and Japan, Germany's enemies in the last war, are now its allies.

Of course, the capitalists will seek to compose their quarrels in face of an actual workers' revolution in any country seeking to develop a combination specifically directed against that revolution.

But they cannot, even in face of the Socialist challenge to their system, cease being capitalists. They cannot share profits and territories with their rivals; they cannot prevent some capitalist States from growing weaker and some stronger. And for these reasons they cannot build a permanent world State.

* * *

IS WAR INEVITABLE?

"Is it not a fact that the resolution of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, 1928, declares that war is inevitable under the capitalist system? Why, then, does the Communist International to-day declare that war can be prevented

under the capitalist system by Peace Pacts and by a strengthened League of Nations?"—J. F. (Kinning Park).

IT is perfectly true that the resolution of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International declared that war was inevitable under the capitalist system.

It is equally clear, however, that the resolution declared that the outbreak of war can be postponed by the action of the working class. It was further made clear at the Sixth Congress that the fact that war is inevitable under a capitalist system does not mean that capitalism can only be overthrown as a result of a crisis created by a war.

It would be wrong to draw too close an analogy with 1914.

In 1914 there was no Socialist great Power striving for peace. To-day, in the Soviet Union, there is such a power.

In 1914 there was no powerful Communist International, uniting the revolutionary workers and exercising a powerful influence on other sections of the working class. To-day there is such an International.

In 1914 the masses had not experienced a world war; the popular will to fight for peace was not so strong as it is to-day.

In 1914 two imperialist combinations confronted each other. Both were on the offensive.

No such situation exists to-day. There is the aggressive imperialist combination of Germany, Italy and Japan, openly claiming a new division of the colonies and markets of the world. But there is no powerful aggressive imperialist combination

confronting these aggressors. The Soviet Union and France are united by the desire to resist the aggressors, but have no desire to attack them or to annex any of their territory.

ENCOURAGING THE AGGRESSORS

The smaller States in Europe, which would only lose by a general European war, support France and the Soviet Union.

But this peace grouping is not strong enough to hold the aggressors in check, because the strongest imperialist Power in Europe, Great Britain, is encouraging the aggressors by negotiating with them on the basis of conniving at the seizure of some other people's territory; in other words, conniving at war.

This policy can, however, be reversed by the action of the British people. The British Government can be forced into co-operation with France and the Soviet Union, and a peace grouping developed around which the small nations of Europe can be rallied, and with which the United States would be prepared to co-operate in the Pacific.

The aggressor States, while strong in the immediate military sense, are weak economically, and can be prevented from breaking out into war by a strong combination in which Britain was the integral part.

Therefore, while it is true to say that war is inevitable under the capitalist system, it does not follow that it is inevitable at any given moment.

FORCE MAKING FOR PEACE

Whether war comes is determined by the struggle between the forces making for peace and the forces

making for war, and the British people can be a powerful section of the force making for peace.

If the outbreak of war can be postponed by forcing the present British Government into the peace grouping, and by later replacing it by a peace Government of Labour and democratic forces, then the way is clear for the working class and the toiling middle class attacking the capitalist system—the cause of Fascism and war.

The advance of the working class in the democratic countries will be a stimulus to the development of the People's Front inside the Fascist countries, and the way will be clear for an all-round victory over the war-makers.

The fight for peace is not a fight for the status quo. We are against a change in the territorial status quo in the interests of Fascism. We are for a change in the social status quo in the interests of the working class.

It is true that world war is inevitable if capitalism endures. It is not, however, inevitable that capitalism shall endure.

* * *

BELGIUM 1914—CHINA 1937

“Why is it that the Communist Party talks of war as a great Imperialist slaughter in which millions of lives were needlessly lost, and the present Chinese conflict as a struggle for freedom?”

“Isn't there a strong similarity between Belgium's position in 1914 and China's to-day? And isn't China a capitalist State as Belgium was? When does the Party decide that a people is striving for its independence and when for its own

capitalist imperialism?”—A. T. S. (London, W.C.2).

THE imperialist war of 1914-18 was not and could not be a war against the German invasion of Belgium, but was a war between two great imperialist alliances for the control of the colonial territories of the globe.

Lenin summed up this aspect of the question as follows:—

“The German imperialists shamefully violated Belgian neutrality; this has always and everywhere been the practice of warring nations which, in the case of necessity, trample on all treaties and obligations.

“Suppose all nations interested in maintaining international treaties declared war against Germany, demanding the liberation and indemnification of Belgium. In this case the sympathy of Socialists would naturally be on the side of Germany’s enemies.

NOT FOR BELGIUM

“The truth, however, is that the war is being waged by the ‘Triple’ (and Quadruple) Entente, *not* for the sake of Belgium. This is well known, and only hypocrites can conceal it. England is robbing German colonies and Turkey; Russia is robbing Galicia and Turkey; France is striving to obtain Alsace-Lorraine and even the left bank of the Rhine; a treaty providing for the sharing of spoils (in Albania and Asia Minor) has been concluded with Italy; with Bulgaria and Rumania there is haggling as to the division of spoils.

“In the present war, conducted by the present Government, it is impossible to help Belgium without helping to throttle Austria, Turkey, etc.”

(*Socialism and War*. Volume 18. Collected Works of Lenin. Martin Lawrence.)

CHINESE STRUGGLE

While the war of 1914-18 was not a war for the defence of Belgium from imperialist aggression, the

present struggle of the Chinese people is precisely such a war.

The difference between the war of a colonial people and a war between Imperialist States was also clearly described by Lenin in the above-mentioned essay.

“There have been many wars in history which, notwithstanding all the horrors, cruelties, miseries and tortures, inevitably connected with every war, had a progressive character, i.e., they serve the development of mankind, aiding in the destruction of extremely reactionary institutions (as, for instance, absolutism and serfdom).”

Lenin goes on to show that armed struggles of colonial peoples for their liberation are precisely such types of progressive war.

“For instance, if Morocco were to declare war against France to-morrow, or India against England, or Persia or China against Russia, these would be ‘just,’ ‘defensive’ wars, no matter which one was the first to attack. Every Socialist would then wish the victory of the oppressed, dependent, non-sovereign States, against the oppressing slave-holding, pillaging ‘great’ nations.”

IMPERIALIST WARS

It is ridiculous to compare an imperialist war with such struggles.

“Imagine that a slaveholder possessing 100 slaves wages war against a slaveholder possessing 200 slaves for a more ‘equitable’ redistribution of slaves. It is evident that to apply to such a case the term ‘defensive’ war or ‘defence of the Fatherland’ would be an historical lie; in practice it would mean that the crafty slaveholders were plainly deceiving the unenlightened masses, the lower strata of the city population.”

For the above reasons the Communist Parties in colonial countries support the bourgeois-liberation movements when these movements are genuinely

fighting for national independence. At the same time, the Communist Parties do not sink their identity in such movements, but, on the contrary, preserve the identity of the Communist Party and the working-class movement. That is the policy being pursued by the Communist Party in China to-day; it has no resemblance to the policy of a workers' Party in an imperialist country supporting its own Government in a robber war.

* * *

SOVIET PEACE POLICY

" . . . Or suppose, on the contrary, that he wished to urge that Russia's old foreign policy of isolation from the League and the 'bourgeois' Government's was the right one and should be adopted again."—(Daily Herald, December 13).

ANY Russian worker would be able to tell the *Daily Herald* that the question of why the Soviet Union entered the League of Nations and what policy it is pursuing in that institution has been discussed over and over again in Russia.

He would also be able to inform the *Daily Herald* that Soviet Russia has never pursued a policy of isolation from bourgeois Governments.

From the first moment of its existence the Soviet Union, in the interests of its self-preservation as a fortress of Socialism, has had to utilise the contradictions between the capitalist powers.

When, in the spring of 1918, the young Soviet Government was in conflict with German Imperialism on the question of peace terms, it entered into

negotiations with agents of the French Government in order to procure assistance in its resistance to German Imperialism. Clemenceau, however, hated Soviet Russia more than he hated German Imperialism and refused assistance.

When, in 1922, at the Genoa Conference, Lloyd George and Briand were endeavouring to form a capitalist United Front against the Soviet Union, seeking to reduce it to the status of a colony, this effort was thwarted by the Soviet Union signing the Rapallo Treaty with the German Republic.

So far from the Soviet Union pursuing a policy of isolation from the bourgeois Governments, it participated in the Genoa Conference (1922), Moscow Disarmament Conference with Poland, Finland, Latvia and Esthonia (December, 1922), the Preparatory Disarmament Conference (1927), and the signing of the Kellogg Pact (1929). It also signed treaties and pacts of non-aggression with neighbouring countries.

The Soviet Union remained outside the League of Nations because that body was for years dominated by the French and British imperialists, the leading Powers favouring intervention in the Soviet Union, imposing huge indemnities on the German people and savagely suppressing the revolts of the colonial peoples.

With the rise of Hitler to power in Germany a notable change took place. The French bourgeoisie, in the main, abandoned their interventionist policy in the Soviet Union, their place as the leading interventionist Power being taken by Nazi Germany.

Because the League was a barrier to the achievement of their aims, Japan and Germany left it.

The League—no longer a force for anti-Soviet intervention—became the centre of those countries which did not want a new war for the division of the markets and colonies of the world. This change facilitated the adherence of the Soviet Union to the League for the purpose of strengthening those forces who do not want war, thus barring the way of the Fascist aggressors.

Now, how could the Soviet Union return to the policy which it pursued previous to entering the League of Nations?

The conditions which existed in Europe have fundamentally changed.

In place of a disarmed German Republic, whose attitude to the Soviet Union was, on the whole, friendly, we have a heavily armed Nazi Germany, organising a war pact (the so-called anti-Comintern Pact) against the Soviet Union and the democratic countries. Any one in Russia who suggested the return to a policy of isolation from the League would be regarded as an unfortunate political illiterate, and perhaps some member of the Young Communist League would be deputed to explain patiently to him the changes that have taken place in the world since 1933.

The present foreign policy of the Soviet Union was one of the main themes of all the election speeches. It was dealt with in a particularly detailed fashion in the speech of Litvinov to his constituents, reported at considerable length in the Soviet Press. If anyone wanted further enlightenment there were

more than enough election agitators willing to explain it to him at public meetings or in his own home.

But it is not the Russian worker who needs enlightenment. And it is not enlightenment, but honesty that is needed by the *Herald*.

* * *

ALLIANCES AND PEACE

"Could the Soviet Union have a military alliance with Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy; if so, would that be in keeping with the policy of countries like the Soviet Union which wishes to improve the position of its workers as against Germany and Italy, who destroy all freedom of the workers, and if so, would an alliance of that description promote world peace?"—E. B. (Arbroath).

THE reactionary Press of Britain and France has insinuated from time to time that the Soviet Union is seeking an understanding with Nazi Germany. The object of this lying insinuation is to convince the people of the Western countries that they cannot rely on the Soviet Union for the defence of peace. It is particularly designed to convince the French people that they cannot rely on the Soviet Union to honour its obligations under the Franco-Soviet Pact.

There is not an iota of fact that could be adduced in support of these insinuations, while a great mass of incontrovertible facts tell against them.

It is well known to everybody that the Soviet

Union has for the last year been rooting out Fascist agents found on its territory. It has in great public trials exposed them as emissaries of the German and Japanese imperialists. That is hardly a method of seeking a rapprochement with Germany.

On the other hand, the German imperialists have not tried to conceal their hatred of the Soviet Union. They have reiterated in countless speeches the claim to the territory of the Soviet Ukraine, first made by Hitler in his book, "Mein Kampf" (My Fight).

Their whole diplomacy has worked quite openly to drive a wedge between France and the Soviet Union to the mutual destruction of both.

The attitude of Japan and of Italy have been no less clear. Japan has engaged in the most provocative activity on the Soviet's eastern frontiers and Italy has sunk Soviet ships in the Mediterranean.

And yet when these three Powers come together in an anti-Comintern Pact, which is aimed at the Soviet Union in the first place, a certain section of the capitalist Press keeps talking about the possibility of an agreement between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany.

WHAT BASIS

What basis could there be for a military alliance between the Soviet Union and the Fascists even if the latter were to miraculously abandon their intention of attacking the Soviet Union?

Germany, Italy and Japan have strained the economic life of their country to breaking point in order to build up a gigantic war machine, with a view to an early war.

If that war machine cannot produce returns in the near future in the shape of conquered territory, this extraordinary expenditure will, even from the imperialist point of view, be a senseless and stupid crime.

On the other hand, the whole economy of the Soviet Union is being built up to satisfy the needs of the people.

Consequently the Soviet Union engages in huge arms expenditure with the greatest reluctance, being impelled thereto by the threats which the Fascists are making against the new Socialist Society.

The Soviet Union would regard a war as an unmitigated disaster, because it would dissipate resources which would otherwise be used to improve the standard of life of the people, whereas the Fascists tell their peoples that war is a means to their enrichment.

A war of the Fascists would, on the hypothesis of our correspondent, be directed against the democratic countries. If successful it would result in the destruction of parliamentary democracy and the dissolution of the workers' organisations in these countries. This would be a tremendous blow to the Soviet Union, for the workers in the democratic countries are its best allies.

So not only because the Fascist states have declared that the Soviet Union is their main enemy, but also because of the incompatibility of the aims of Fascism and the Soviet Union on the international field (no less than in the internal life of the countries) a military alliance between Fascism and the Soviet Union is unthinkable.

IN WAR AGAINST FASCISM

"In the event of a war between Britain, France, U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. on the one hand, and Germany, Italy and Japan on the other, what would be the attitude of the Left-Wing in general and the Communist Party in particular?"

"We understand, of course, that the suppression of Fascism is of major importance, but this would mean the Left-Wing supporting an imperialist government and war, which would be in direct contradiction with its avowed policy."—J. S. (Clapton), H. R. (Manchester).

THERE would require to be a complete change in the foreign policy of the British Government before the basic assumptions of the above question could be accepted, for the Government is resisting the formation of such a grouping of Socialist and democratic capitalist Powers as the question indicates.

Were such a grouping formed it would not lead to war because it would be strong enough to force the Fascists to keep the peace.

We would also insist that our fundamental policy must be directed to fighting to build such a peace bloc, rather than engaging in speculations as to what should happen if war broke out.

ATTITUDE OF WORKING CLASS

Still, in default of the peace policy, it is conceivable that a capitalist democratic country like France might find itself ranged alongside the Soviet Union in a war against the Fascist States. What should be the attitude of the working class in such a country?

During the war of 1914-18, Lenin declared that the working class in each of the imperialist alliances was interested in the defeat of its own Government, because such defeat would help forward the workers' revolution.

Is "defeatism" still the best policy for the workers in a capitalist country associated with the Soviet Union in a war? Obviously not, for such a policy would help a Fascist victory (1) over the Soviet Union, with the consequent danger of the destruction of Socialist economy; and (2) the overthrow of Parliamentary democracy and the extermination of the working-class movement. The workers are therefore interested in the victory of the anti-Fascist combination.

CHANGING THE GOVERNMENT

Does this mean that the workers in the capitalist country, which is co-operating with the Soviet Union, should support their Government? On the contrary, they might drive to change the Government in the interest of victory.

In Britain they would seek to replace the National Government—assuming it is in office—by a Labour and Democratic Government. In France they would strive for a Popular Front Government further to the Left of the present Government—a Government including the Communists.

The workers' movement would remain vigilant and independent of capitalist Governments of the type of the National Government of Great Britain, because such Governments (1) would be inclined to betray the Soviet Union in the midst of the war; (2) seek to put the cost of the war on the shoulders of

the working class, sparing the big capitalists; (3) in the event of a victory over the Fascists seek to impose harsh terms on the people of the former Fascist countries, even if they had got rid of their Fascist dictators.

INDEPENDENT MOVEMENT

Nevertheless there should be a difference in the attitude of the working class in a Fascist country fighting the Soviet Union and in a democratic country associated with the Soviet Union.

The victory of the Hitler Government would be the defeat of the German people. The defeat of Hitler would be their victory.

The workers in a Fascist country are interested in the defeat of their Government, and must therefore do everything to impede the effective prosecution of the war.

The workers in a capitalist country associated with the Soviet Union are interested in victory, and must do everything to further it. A necessary condition of victory is to remember the class sympathy between democratic and Fascist capitalists, and therefore for the workers' movement to retain its complete independence.

* * *

FASCISM AND COLONIES

"Should the British working-class movement make any sacrifice in order to maintain the peace of the world and democracy?"

"For example, should we accept a lower standard of living, if by doing so we could give colonies to disgruntled countries like Germany and prevent a war?"

"Or should we maintain democracy at all costs, even a capitalist democracy, and hope to obtain a Socialist State at a later date?"—P. R. (Tottenham).

THE Labour movement would be making a profound mistake if it supported that section of pro-German capitalist opinion in Great Britain which asserts that peace can be maintained by making concessions to Germany.

What concessions could be offered? It is obvious that none of the great imperialist countries will be prepared to grant any important colonial concessions to Germany. The Colonies of the smaller countries are associated with the colonial system of the great imperialist States. Thus a great deal of British capital is invested in the Dutch and Portuguese Colonies and a great deal of French in the Belgian Colonies.

All the imperialist countries, in spite of their Colonies, have even in the midst of the boom, unutilised capital and unemployed workers. They are extremely unlikely to give up any of their colonial market, or any of their possibilities of profitable colonial investment in order to "appease Germany."

CONCESSIONS IN EUROPE

It is also suggested that there might be concessions of territory to Germany in Central Europe, as, for example, Austria and the German districts of Czechoslovakia.

It is clear, however, that such concessions of territory would not contribute to improving the economic position of Germany nor to compensate German Fascism for the enormous expenditure on

arms—amounting to one-fifth of the annual income—that it has engaged on.

Only the winning of a greater block of European and colonial territory than is possible through negotiations, backed by threats, will be regarded by German Fascism as an adequate return for its huge expenditure.

All that small territorial concessions—particularly in Europe—will do is to increase the cannon fodder of German and Italian Fascism preparing for large-scale war.

We must further see German and Italian Fascism not as pre-war imperialist States but as armed counter-revolution, aiming to destroy the Soviet Union and the democratic States of Europe.

This does not mean that the British working class should not make efforts to defend peace and democracy. These efforts should be made along the lines of fighting for the establishment of a powerful peace bloc—based on the co-operation of France, Britain and the Soviet Union—which could rally the small States of Europe around it and could reach a basis of co-operation with the United States of America.

This bloc could create such overwhelming force as would compel the Fascist aggressors to keep the peace, and give their peoples the opportunity of gathering their forces to overthrow their oppressors.

CAUSE OF LOW STANDARDS

While a capitalist class with colonies is in an advantageous position compared with a capitalist class without colonies, it is not true that the low standard of life of the German and Italian workers

is due to the lack of colonies. On the contrary, it is due to their intensified exploitation by the capitalists and landlords and the crushing burden of the military machine that their rulers are building up in preparation for a war of conquest.

The overthrow of these exploiters would mean an immediate improvement in the standard of life of the people of Germany and Italy.

The same applies to the British workers. By overthrowing our capitalist class we could immediately raise our standard of life while abandoning the robbery of the colonial peoples.

Democracy must be defended from internal and external attack, because it provides the best conditions for the advance of the working class to Socialism.

The policy of colonial concessions to Fascism must be opposed because it is in opposition to the building of a peace bloc which might hold Fascism in check and because under the guise of avoiding war it undermines both peace and democracy.

* * *

SOVIET TRADE WITH GERMANY

"In 'Labour,' the official organ of the National Council of Labour, for January, there is an article by Mr. Stephen Sanders, M.P., who claims that the Soviet Union is helping German Fascism because it is buying more from Germany than it is selling to Germany.

"Will you be good enough to give me the latest figures with regard to this for the Soviet Union, Great Britain and other leading countries?"—
P. G. (Battersea).

THE British Department of Overseas Trade gives the following figures:—

The Soviet Union bought from Germany goods to the value of 101,900,000 marks and sold goods to the value of 49,600,000 marks in the nine months from January to September, 1937. There was thus a balance of 52,300,000 marks in favour of Germany as a result of nine months' trading. At $12\frac{1}{2}$ marks to the £, the favourable balance of Germany was £4,092,000.

When on the basis of such a tiny balance Mr. Sanders states that the Soviet Union is helping Hitler to maintain his domination and prepare for a war against Communism, it is clear he is losing all sense of proportion.

To say, "Russia buys more from that country (i.e., Germany—J. R. C.) than from any other and moreover by so doing provides Herr Hitler with a handsome favourable trade balance which assists him in buying from foreign countries the materials he requires for his gigantic arms programme" he is talking undiluted nonsense.

How far would a sum of four million pounds go in financing a "gigantic arms programme"?

BRITAIN SPENT

In the same period British capitalism sold 231,100,000 marks' worth of goods to Germany and bought 305,600,000 marks' worth. This gives Germany a favourable balance of £5,720,000 as a result of its trade with Britain.

It will be noted that while the favourable balance secured by Germany as a result of trading with Britain is more than £1,700,000 greater than that

secured from the Soviet Union, the net amount of German goods bought by Britain is three times as much as that bought by the Soviet Union.

Indeed, Great Britain bought more from Germany than did any other country in the world, with the exception of Germany's immediate neighbour, Holland, which bought 347,300,000 marks' worth in the nine months in question. Yet Mr. Sanders does not suggest that Britain should boycott German goods, nor that a British Labour Government would do so.

It would be silly to suggest this policy because of the peculiar characteristics of German trade, which is spread all over the world in such a way that no considerable amount is done with any one country.

TRADE BOYCOTT

This means that a trade boycott to be effective would have to be operated by a large number of countries. To suggest that the Soviet Union by stopping trade with Germany and depriving it of a favourable trade balance which will probably amount to more than £6,000,000 for the whole of 1937, could really impede German war preparations is gravely to mislead the British people.

When a whole range of mountains is made out of this tiny mole-hill, when it is possible for Stephen Sanders to write of Soviet trade policy as "this soulless capitalist trading policy and its cold-blooded laissez-faire justification," the rank and file of the Labour movement are justified in asking who is behind this anti-Soviet campaign in the Labour Press.

Mr. Stephen Sanders we know. He was one of

those prominent Labour leaders who engaged in a certain amount of propaganda for the Government during the imperialist war of 1914-18, and was no friend of the Bolshevik revolution when it broke out.

Labour Party workers will also be entitled to ask whether Mr. Peter Petroff, who is sometimes seen at Transport House, and is an occasional contributor to "Labour," is also one of the National Council of Labour's authorities on Russia. We would suggest that an ex-Soviet employee with a grouse may not be the best person for the British Labour movement to turn to for advice on Russian questions.

* * *

WHY VOTE AGAINST THE ARMS PLAN ?

"Is it consistent for the Communist Party to demand that the Labour movement shall vote against the Arms Programme of the Government, and at the same time demand that the Government adhere to the Franco-Soviet Pact and to collective security? If collective security means a pooling of armed strength, why vote against the Arms Policy of the Government?"—P. K. (Charlton).

A VOTE against the Arms Policy of the Government is not a vote against arms. It is not a vote for the dissolution of the Army, Navy and Air Force. It is a vote expressing the sharpest possible opposition to the use to which the Government is putting arms.

The Parliamentary Labour Party, in justifying its vote against the Estimates in July, 1936, made this clear when it said in a public statement:—

"In order to mark its entire opposition to the international policy of the Government, of which the rearmament programme is an integral part, the Labour Party will, on July 27 and 28, vote against the Estimate for the fighting services.

"A vote against an Estimate is not a vote for the abolition of the service concerned, but is a vote in opposition to the policy of which the Estimate is the expression."

We wholeheartedly agree. Those who talk platitudes about "arms are necessary for collective security," or "arms are necessary for defence," do so in order to evade the question of whether the present Government is using arms to promote collective security or to defend the British people.

For if it is not using arms for these purposes, it is betraying the British people.

Mr. John Marchbank, secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, has been the most consistent, and the least convincing, supporter of the policy of voting arms for the present Government. He is still defending this policy in the current number of the *Railway Review*. But in the same notes he is forced to declare:—

"One is almost forced to the conclusion that there are in the present Government and in the parties behind it those who do not want to see the Fascist régimes defeated in the conflicts with Social Democracy—the conflict that underlies and determines the present course of political and military events, in China as in Spain. This, indeed, is the real war that is raging. Can anyone say with certainty on which side our present Government is fighting?"

"Who are the friends of Fascism in the Cabinet?" asks Mr. Marchbank.

In other words, the British Government is pur-

suing a policy which is promoting a Fascist victory. The more arms it gets the more resolutely it can pursue this policy; the more it can use its armed might to keep France in line with this policy.

The interests of peace, of collective security, of the real defence of the British people, demand a fight against this policy. The Labour Party support of the Arms Plan impedes this fight and enables Eden to say: "If it (i.e., the Arms Vote of the Labour Party) is a precursor of close unity in other spheres, so much the better." (House of Commons debate, October 22, 1937.)

The friends of Fascism in the Cabinet hold out the hand of friendship to the Labour Party and welcome closer unity.

That is the first fruit of the Arms Vote of the Labour Party. Because this vote disorganises the struggle against the "friends of Fascism," it is a blow to collective security and peace.

* * *

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE WORKERS

"I have the following questions to ask regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat:—

"(1) Does the 'proletariat' mean only the wage earners, or does it include students, shopkeepers, doctors, etc.?"

"(2) Is it true that under the dictatorship of the proletariat free expression of opinion or criticism will be denied?"

"(3) If not, why this affection for the word 'dictatorship'? In any case, the proletariat would,

I take it, represent the majority, consequently, the use of the word would appear to involve a contradiction.

"From my experience objection is taken by many to the word 'dictatorship' which is considered analogous to intolerance and quite incompatible with democracy."—F. J. (New Southgate).

THE dictatorship of the proletariat is the scientific term for a Revolutionary Workers' Government.

Such a Government is based on:—

(1) The taking over of the land, the great industries and the banks;

(2) Workers' Councils (Soviets) which were the mass organisations of the workers previous to the revolution. It has armed itself with emergency powers for suppressing all attempts at counter-revolution.

DICTATORSHIP NOT MERELY FORCE

The dictatorship is not merely force, however. It aims at the re-education of the former exploiters and also of the small proprietors who will probably continue to run their small businesses in the early stages of dictatorship.

In Soviet Russia all people employing hired labour, all former landlords and capitalists, all former police, all priests were, up to the introduction of the new Constitution, deprived of the right to vote. Lenin emphasised, however, that this was not necessarily a feature of a workers' dictatorship everywhere.

DEMOCRACY FOR THE WORKERS

Such a dictatorship over the exploiters is at the same time a democracy for the workers. All the restrictions which the capitalist system places on the workers' freedom of speech and meeting, are abolished. The workers have and exercise the right of criticism with regard to all the activities of the Government. All capitalist propaganda aiming at the restoration of capitalism is suppressed.

The reply to our comrade's question is, therefore, as follows:—

(1) The proletariat means all those who sell their labour (manual or mental) to the capitalists for wages or salary. It does not include doctors or small shopkeepers. These, however, can be made the allies of the workers, for the dictatorship need not rest on the workers alone, but on an alliance between the workers and the toiling middle class.

(2) A Revolutionary Government using emergency powers is still a dictatorship if it uses these powers to suppress an exploiting minority.

AGAINST THE EXPLOITERS

The bad odour of the word dictatorship is due to the misrepresentation of the enemies of the workers who conceal the fact that it is a dictatorship directed against the exploiters which is, at the same time, a democracy for the workers.

They also deliberately confuse it with the dictatorship of Fascism, which is a dictatorship of the exploiting minority over the workers.

If our correspondent wants a short, simple definition in the English language, then he might utilise the phrase of the Chartist, George Julian Harney:—

"The absolute supremacy of the working class preparatory to the abolition of the system of classes."

The dictatorship is transient and will disappear with the realisation of Communism.

* * *

WHAT IS STATE CAPITALISM ?

"What does the term 'State Capitalism' mean, and what is the best answer to the statement that it is the form of organisation in the Soviet Union at the present time?"—W. R. (Leeds).

THERE can be no "State Capitalism" without a capitalist class and there is no capitalist class in the Soviet Union.

"State Capitalism" can be the ownership or control of industry by the capitalist State in the interests of the capitalist class as a whole. Or it can be the regulation of industry, which a workers' state has, for the moment allowed to remain in the hands of the capitalists.

We will take two aspects of State capitalism. Cheap postal, telegraph and telephone facilities are necessary to the smooth development of capitalist business. To allow a private monopoly to establish itself in this sphere would be to give facilities to a section of the capitalist class to squeeze the class as a whole.

Postal facilities become, therefore, a monopoly, owned by the Government. The service is operated not for the benefit of the workers or for the community in general but in the interest of cheap facilities for the capitalist class.

CHEAP POWER

Take electricity. The capitalist class desire cheap power, and in a number of areas it was the local business men who led the way in establishing municipal ownership of industry.

Now the State is moving forward to a closer control over production and distribution—although it is showing undue leniency to the private monopolies.

This is not a move to Socialism but a move to prevent certain groups of monopolists from unduly squeezing the capitalist class as a whole.

CONCESSIONS IN U.S.S.R.

In the early days of the Soviet régime there were suggestions for the development of State capitalist enterprises in Russia. These enterprises were in the form of concessions leased to foreign capitalists. The foreign capitalists were to be subject to the Labour code of the Soviet Union and to a certain amount of State regulation. Subject to these conditions they were free to go ahead and make profit.

In actual fact, few such concessions were established, and concession industry has now disappeared from the Soviet Union. The only state capitalism now existing is that of the capitalist countries.

In what way does State capitalism differ from the Socialist system in the Soviet Union?

The aim of State capitalism is to increase the profits of the monopoly capitalists taken as a whole.

The aim of Socialism is to produce wealth to satisfy the needs of the people.

Under State capitalism a certain group of monopoly interests is controlled by the capitalist

State. The exploitation of workers by capitalists continues.

EXPLOITATION CEASES

Under Socialism all industry is run by the organs of the Workers' State. The capitalist class is eliminated. The exploitation of the workers by the capitalists ceases.

While capitalism builds up capitalist State enterprises the bulk of industry remains in the hands of private capitalist firms. There can, therefore, be no planning of industry as a whole.

Under Socialism it is possible to plan wealth production as a whole and eliminate crises and unemployment altogether.

In the Soviet Union society is Socialist. The means of production and distribution are State or collective property.

They are co-ordinated in a common plan to satisfy the needs of the people. This is Socialism, or as Lenin put it, "the first stage of Communism."

ONWARD TO COMMUNISM

There are still in this stage unequal wages and salaries. The formula of distribution is "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work."

There is still a social difference between manual and mental labour and between workers and peasants.

The Workers' State still requires to retain its powers of coercion. But as production increases, as educational facilities increase, as the workers are drawn into the administration of the State in greater numbers, Socialist society moves forward to Com-

munism, where the formula of distribution will be "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

* * *

ABOUT A RULING CLASS

"Is there a ruling class in the Soviet Union to-day or the beginnings of such a class?"—L. H. (S.E.9).

A RULING CLASS is a section of society which is in control of the vital means of wealth production by which that society lives.

Thus, for example, the ruling class in ancient time owned land and masses of slaves. The feudal lords in the middle ages owned the land, and the modern ruling class of finance capitalists own the banks, the great industries, the means of communication, and the land.

Note that this ruling class obtains an income not by working, but by exploitation. Its ownership of the means of production enables it to appropriate all the values that the workers produce in industry over and above the value of their labour power.

There is no such class in the Soviet Union, where the means of production are social property (the great industries, etc.) or group property (the collective farms).

There is, therefore, no class in Soviet society that is able to obtain a tremendous share of the wealth of society in virtue of its ownership of the means of production.

PRIVILEGED GROUPS?

But, it may be asked, are there not privileged groups in the sense that one category of workers is paid more than another? Let us take an example. A highly skilled worker in the engineering industry will earn much more than an unskilled worker. The delegation of the Amalgamated Engineering Union showed that while unskilled workers were receiving from 70 kopecks to one rouble per hour, skilled workers were receiving from two to three roubles per hour.

But where is the privilege? The highly skilled worker is rendering more service to society and is getting more in return. It would be the raw, unskilled worker just in from the village who was being privileged if he got the same wage as the highly skilled worker who was rendering greater service.

But there is no privileged position for the highly skilled worker, for every facility is given to the less skilled to improve his qualifications and enter the skilled section.

But it may be objected there is the Communist Party, which has only two million members. Is there no danger of this Party becoming an economically privileged caste, which in turn would evolve into an economically privileged class?

Communist Party members have no economic privileges. Indeed, it might even be held that membership entails certain economic disadvantages, in the sense that the Party member is at the disposal of the Party for any work that it may care to allot him. The Party is composed of workers and employees in the most varied positions.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

Workers in the factories, tractor operators, peasants on the land, soldiers and officers in the army, technicians in industry are all in the Party, the greatest specific weight being that of the industrial workers.

The members of this ruling Party have no economic privileges and indeed have duties such as are not borne by the non-Party worker. The officials of the Party are elected by secret ballot.

Nor is there the possibility of a privileged upper stratum of State officials, technicians, and better-paid workers combining to extract from society wages and salaries out of all proportion to the services that they are rendering.

There is no "irremovable bureaucracy" in the Soviet Union. Recent events have shown that apart from the punishment of acknowledged wreckers, high Party and State officials neglectful of their duties have been removed and workers promoted in their places.

It must not be forgotten that not only the Party but the trade unions watch over the distribution of wealth. The Unions in framing collective agreements, in examining the economic plan are able to detect and oppose any tendencies to the overpayment of the higher wage and salary groups in society and can thus check the slightest tendency to the growth of economic privilege.

There is therefore no privileged class in the Soviet Union, and the path to the formation of such a class is effectively blocked.

* * *

THIS TIME THE "HERALD"

"In the Soviet Union 'the mere act of nationalisation does not settle everything by any means.'

"It does not settle the question of whether there shall be a large poor class and a small wealthy class existing together. For in a State-owned industry it is perfectly possible for the mass of the workers to be badly paid while the managers and Party officials are paid salaries that are enormously larger."—(Daily Herald, December 13, 1937).

THE *Herald* calmly assumes that such a question is confronting the people of the Soviet Union to-day. It ignores the fact that this is precisely the point that has got to be proved.

It is not a question of what could theoretically take place in any nationalised industry, but what is actually taking place in the nationalised industry of the Soviet Union—a nationalised industry based on a working-class revolution.

There is no question as to the policy being pursued in the nationalised industry in the Soviet Union. It is defined in the election manifesto of the Communist Party: "He who wants the toilers of our country to continue to be free of any unemployment whatever, he who desires a further improvement in the material and living conditions of the workers and office employees, will vote for the candidates of the Bolsheviks, he will vote for the candidates of the bloc of Communists and non-Party people"

WAGES INCREASED

This promise is embodied in the plan for 1937, which provides for the following increases of wages:

Heavy Industry, Engineering and Defence Industry, 10.1 per cent.; Light Industry, 10 per cent.; Food Industry, 8 per cent.; Timber Industry, 9 per cent. That was the real question before the Soviet people, that is what they voted for.

Along with this goes the "raising of the cultural-technical level of the working class to the level of engineers and technical workers."

But what guarantee is there that the managers and technicians in industry will not band together to secure a disproportionate return for their services at the expense of the great mass of the workers in industry?

Such a thing is possible in the nationalised industry in a capitalist State, because such managers and technicians are part of the upper bureaucracy of this State. The workers have not the possibility of fundamentally checking such tendencies, because power is in the hands of the capitalist class.

But in the Soviet Union power is in the hands of the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, who now are almost 100 per cent. in the collective farms. The managers, technicians and Party officials could not act independently of the working class organised in the Communist Party and in the great trade unions, with over 20,000,000 members. That is the guarantee for development proceeding on the lines laid down by the Communist Party.

SALARIES UNDER CONTROL

Managers and technicians will be paid a higher salary than the rest of the workers as an inducement to the others to qualify themselves for managerial posts. But their salaries are under control, and the

declared policy is steadily to advance the workers' wages to a higher level in accordance with the mastery of technique and the growth of wealth production. As for the Party officials, many a Stakhanov worker in industry has already caught up and surpassed their salaries.

Wage policy is not a closed book to the workers in the Soviet Union. It is discussed continually, particularly in the union meetings called to discuss the collective contracts for the following year.

The rôle of differential wages in stimulating the workers to raise their technical levels, to increase wealth production, has been repeatedly explained and approved.

If any worker disagreed with this policy he could have expressed his point of view at the factory meetings called to nominate candidates for the elections. He could have demanded that a candidate should be put forward expressing the opposition to present wage policy. But it is unlikely that he could have got support for this point of view.

The workers knew what the wage policy was and voted for it. The *Herald's* question is an expression, not of the realities of the Soviet Union, but of the fantasies of the enemies of the great Workers' State.

* * *

BEDAUX AND STAKHANOV

"Why is 'scientific management' and speeding-up a good thing when associated with Stakhanov, and a bad thing when associated with Bedaux? What is the difference (if any)? If it is a fact (as stated in the capitalist press) that several 'pace-

setters' have been murdered in the U.S.S.R., does not this show that speeding-up is hated in that country as much as in America?"—F. L. W. (W.10).

SPEEDING-UP is bad, whatever it is associated with, but the Stakhanov movement has nothing to do with speeding-up.

Stakhanov was a miner, who discovered improved methods of using technique at the disposal of the workers in Russia's coal industry.

His discovery was based on the division of labour. Instead of the same miner doing coal-cutting, timbering, etc., each member of a team did specialised operations. The net result was that a great amount of coal could be cut with less expenditure of labour than was the case under the old methods of working.

The piece prices are strictly regulated by the trade unions in Soviet Russia; the workers' increased output was reflected in increased earnings.

Similar methods of improving production by the better use of technique were discovered and applied by the workers in other industries in the Soviet Union.

Most of the workers who applied Stakhanovite methods were products of the technical schools of the Soviet Union, and were applying the knowledge they had acquired in practice.

The Bedaux system is based primarily, not on the improved use of existing technique, but on the speeding-up of the worker. Stakhanov studied how the machinery at his disposal could be better used. The Bedaux experts study how the worker can slave more intensively in the interest of his employer.

Bedaux studies the workers' activity in production with a view to eliminating slack periods in his work. The reports of the Bedaux experts enable the employers to set a standard of output for the worker, far above that which was the rule before the expert was called in.

Some extra earnings will doubtless be made in the early stages of the introduction of the Bedaux system but these will gradually be reduced, so that after a while the worker is giving a vastly greater output for the same earnings.

The introduction of the Bedaux system has no meaning to the capitalist class unless it leads to this result.

It should be clear from the above that Stakhanovites are not "pace-setters," but people who are showing the workers and the management how to increase production by a better use of equipment without increasing the pace of the individual.

In the early days of the Stakhanov movement some leading supporters of the new methods were attacked by hostile elements in the factories. These hostile elements, ex-private traders and peasants, opposed the movement because it was an exposure of bad, careless workmanship. Since, however, the Stakhanov movement in industry after industry has shown the way to increased earnings for the workers without speed-up, it has now the workers' enthusiastic approval.

The Soviet Government has recognised that to increase production by a better use of equipment necessitates giving the Stakhanovites the opportunity of all-round technical training. The resolution

of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the Stakhanovite movement states:—

“All Stakhanovites, without exception, must be helped to improve their technical knowledge and special spare-time technical courses must be arranged for them.”

Stakhanovism means the mastery of technique by the workers, and strives for an all-round technically educated working class. The Bedaux system means the speed-up of the individual worker and his reduction to a robot. There is no similarity between the systems. Their aims and methods are entirely different.

* * *

ONCE MORE THE “DAILY HERALD”

“What would happen to a Soviet worker who wished to say that he thought the distribution of wealth under Stalin was socially unjust, and that the workers and peasants should be made richer by making managers, administrators and Party leaders poorer?”

“And that differences of pay of anything up to fifteen to one between workers and up to fifty to one between workers and managers was much too capitalistic for his liking?”

“He would certainly lose his freedom and he would be extremely lucky not to lose his life.”—
(Daily Herald, December 13, 1937).

THE Herald is rapidly winning top marks in unscrupulous anti-Soviet criticism. An astounding lie is presented in the most matter-of-fact way, as if it was a well-established truth.

Suppose I said that any worker in Germany who publicly declared that Hitler was a fool would soon find himself in prison; my assertion would be justified, for instances of such a thing actually taking place could be cited.

But when the *Herald* says that any worker criticising differential wages in the Soviet Union would lose his freedom, it is lying, for it can cite no instance whatsoever of any such things taking place.

That such vile lies can appear in a Labour paper without the slightest proof being offered, is a thing which should cause every Labour Party member to ask: "Who is inspiring the mendacious anti-Soviet campaign in the *Daily Herald*?"

The payment of differential wages in the Soviet Union has been the practice for years, and the workers have discussed it on hundreds of occasions. The granting of special concessions to workers striving to improve technique and increase output has always been the practice in the Soviet Union.

The trade unions have discussed the question of shock brigades and of the Stakhanov movement for years. Objection was offered by backward workers to differential wages; to shock brigades; to Stakhanovism. The Communist Party and the trade unions answered those objections and won the backward elements for their policy.

But where is the case of a worker being punished because he dared to express criticism?

As to wage differences between workers being at "anything up to 15 to one," what is the *Herald* referring to here?

The delegation of the Amalgamated Engineering

Union gives the following information as to engineering wages:—

GRADE 1 (Lowest grade of labour, tending to disappear): From 70 kopecks to 1 rouble per hour.

GRADE 2 (Women cleaners and light labour; at best a temporary grade): From 90 kopecks to 1 rouble 2 kopecks per hour.

GRADE 3 (Semi-skilled): From 1.25 to 1.55 roubles per hour.

GRADE 7 (Highly skilled): Tool, jig and general gauge making: From 2.6 to 2.75 roubles per hour.

GRADE 8 (Charge hands and men of super skill): 3.6 roubles per hour.

There is in general no ratio of fifteen to one in this industry.

But it is possible for a Stakhanov worker who has found a new method of utilising technique to get a wage based on his output that may be as far above the wage of the highly-skilled worker as the wage of the highly-skilled is above that of the lowest unskilled. But if that is the basis of the *Herald's* assertion, why does it, in the next breath, suggest that "Stakhanovism is a form of sweating"? (December 13).

One cannot protest in the one paragraph about high Stakhanov wages and in the next assert that "Stakhanovism is a form of sweating."

And if the *Herald's* Russian worker complained about high Stakhanov wages, there would be a very simple answer: "Become a Stakhanovite comrade. Stakhanovism is open to all."

As to the general conditions in which the Russian

workers live, we prefer the testimony of the A.E.U. delegation.

"To us at least the individual liberty of the workman should find its chief expression in the place where he earns his daily bread. If we had been traversing a British workshop, accompanied by foremen and technicians, as we were doing in this ball-bearing plant, workmen would have scuffled back to their benches or machines if they had been standing about in twos and threes. Here we witnessed no signs of alarm on the part of the Russian workmen when we came across various groups conversing together."

As to wages being fifty to one between managers and workers, we will deal with this when we are told what managers are being compared with what workers.

In the meantime, we can only say that while the *Herald's* Russian workman is an imaginary being, the dispensers of anti-Soviet lies in the *Herald* are unfortunately only too real.

* * *

ABOUT ADULATION

"... or suppose he merely wished to say that all the adulation of Stalin the Great made him sick."—(*Daily Herald*, December 13).

THE *Herald's* imaginary Russian worker gets more foolish as he goes on, and in the end gets below the level of the most venal and stupid journalist in the service of the capitalist class.

Three points arise from the question that he puts. (1) What is adulation? (2) Is the *Daily Herald* against adulation? (3) Is there adulation of Stalin?

Adulation is "praise in excess or beyond what is merited" (Webster's New International Dictionary).

If an Elizabethan had referred to the "Great Shakespeare" he would not have been guilty of adulation, for his estimate of Shakespeare would have been correct. Even if his praise had been couched in the most glowing terms, it would not have been adulation, because it was not "beyond what is merited."

No one will accuse the *Herald* of being against adulation as such. Read it on MacDonald during his premiership of 1929-31. Read it on the death of King George and you have the most revolting examples of adulation which have ever appeared in the British Press.

LEADERSHIP

Whether Stalin is being praised beyond what is merited can only be answered when one estimates the rôle he has played in the leadership of the Russian workers and peasants.

The Soviet Union has just come through the greatest transformation in human history.

From a backward country it has become a country of highly equipped Socialist industry. The volume of its industrial output is eight times as great as that of pre-war Russia.

Unemployment has been abolished and all citizens are guaranteed the right to leisure and material security in old age.

The oppressed peoples in the former Tsarist Empire have secured their complete liberation from national oppression.

These tremendous changes could not have taken place without unsurpassed political leadership.

For the Russian workers were attempting some-

thing entirely new in history. Not only were they building Socialism, but they were doing it in the conditions of a country that was exceedingly backward culturally and economically. They were advancing in an almost uncharted region without maps.

A capitalist path of development was as possible as the Socialist. Indeed, the leading theoreticians of the Right-wing Socialist Parties in Western Europe (Kautsky and Otto Bauer) declared that the capitalist path was the only possible one. The great mass of peasants and petty traders in the Soviet Union could be, in certain circumstances, a breeding ground of capitalism.

MORTAL DANGER

Lenin, in 1921, posed the question: "Who would beat whom?"—would the working class be able to make a firm alliance with the poor and middle peasants, leading them in the path of Socialism, or would the new private traders—the Nepmen—who were being tolerated within limits under the New Economic Policy, bring the peasantry under their influence, penetrate the Soviets and the Communist Party, and create conditions for the gradual restoration of capitalism?

Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev declared that without the aid of a successful revolution in Western Europe, the restoration of capitalism was inevitable in the Soviet Union. Stalin, developing the policy of Lenin, rallied the Party against this policy and showed that Socialism could be built in a single country.

As part of their policy, Trotsky and Co. advocated

that the Soviet State should "soak" the peasantry. This would have broken the alliance of the workers with the middle peasantry—which was the condition for the advance to successful collectivisation.

The defeat of the Trotskyists saved the Soviet Union from a mortal danger.

WHY NOT?

When the conditions became ripe for rapid industrialisation and collectivisation, the resistance of Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky had to be overcome. What chance would the Soviet Union have in the world to-day if Stalin's policy of industrialisation had not been carried through? In defeating Bukharin, the Party, under the leadership of Stalin, avoided a policy that would have led to disaster.

Why should the Russian workers not praise Stalin, the leader of the greatest social change in all history?

If the *Herald* put the question to a real Russian worker the answer would be clear: "We do not indulge in adulation, we praise where praise is due, we praise the man who made our Socialist victory complete, we praise him as the embodiment of the great Bolshevik Party. Who are you who grossly overpraises the stalest, flattest mediocrities of capitalist society, to talk about adulation?"

* * *

GOODBYE THE "HERALD"

"... Or suppose he merely wished to say ... that the crowd at the Kremlin was a group of dunderheads and ought to be replaced on grounds of pure competence by other men?"—(*Daily Herald*, December 13).

WHY should any sane person in the Soviet Union wish to say it? A few facts:—

Taking Great Britain's production in 1928 as 100, to-day it is 115.

Taking France's production in 1928 as 100, to-day it is 75.

Taking U.S.A.'s production in 1928 as 100, it is to-day 85.

Taking Soviet Union production in 1928 as 100, it is to-day 481.

Or take wages. Metal trade, monthly earnings in 1928 was 91 roubles—in 1936 it was 261 roubles.

Or take the fact that in capitalist countries there were still 20,000,000 unemployed in 1936, while in the Soviet Union unemployment was wiped out in the first years of the Five Year Plan.

The great rise in educational facilities for the workers. In 1928 in the Soviet Union 170,000 persons received a university education and 2,522,000 a secondary education. In 1936 the figures were 522,000, and 6,441,000.

The development of health services has been tremendous. In Tsarist Russia there were only 19,000 physicians. To-day there are 100,000 physicians.

3,707 MATERNITY CLINICS

In Tsarist Russia there were only nine maternity clinics. To-day there are 3,707. The Soviet Government is spending 40 roubles per head for health services every year, as compared with the 90 kopecks (100 kopecks equal one rouble) spent by the Tsarist Government.

The emancipation of women has been achieved.

This is particularly striking in relation to the peasant women.

Here is an example of a Labour contract signed in Tsarist Russia:—

“I . . . a peasant woman, of my own free will, hired myself out for agricultural work on the estate of Count Pototsky for any kind of work I may be called upon to perform, in all for 144 working days, providing my own board, for the total wages of 35 roubles, upon which I have received an advance of 10 roubles. . . . I undertake to begin work at sunrise and finish after sunset.”

The introduction of collective farming has altered the whole position of peasant women. In the collective farm they have equal rights with the men and are coming to the front in administration.

In 1936, 12,423 women held leading positions as directors of collective farms, 2,298 were leaders of cattle-breeding brigades, and 70,099 were leaders of agricultural brigades.

Who had ever heard of crèches and kindergartens in the villages of Tsarist Russia? In 1936 the permanent summer crèches in the villages took charge of 4,451,000 children.

The things for which the workers in Western Europe are still struggling have been gained by the workers in the Soviet Union.

HOLIDAYS WITH PAY

A fortnight's (or, in certain industries, a month's) holiday with pay is guaranteed to the workers.

Workmen's compensation for temporarily disabled workers is paid at the rate of from 75 to 100 per cent. of the ordinary wage.

A full pension for disabled workers amounts to two-thirds of their previous earnings.

Such are a few of the great changes brought about under the leadership of the "people in the Kremlin."

The Russian working class, which has triumphed over all the obstacles under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, would regard with hatred and contempt anyone who dared to describe such a leadership as "dunderheads."

This would be a description, not of a Russian worker, but of a class enemy, filled with a positively lunatic hatred of the Soviet Union and its achievements.

But perhaps we exaggerate. The class enemy in the Soviet Union has been crushed to such an extent that it is hardly likely to underrate the abilities of the leadership of the Soviet people.

That ability is only questioned by the demented egomaniac Trotsky, Fascism's most unscrupulous ally in the struggle against the Soviet Union, and by the *Daily Herald*, which scours the earth for anti-Soviet slanders—White Guard, Fascist or Trotskyist—and serves them up for the confusion of the British working class.

* * *

CONTRADICTIONS IN SOCIALIST SOCIETY

"According to dialectical materialism, society is impelled forward by the force of the contradiction. This is obvious in capitalist society, but in the U.S.S.R. are there no contradictions? If so,

why are they not allowed expression?"—
(Question at Bolton Lecture).

THE questioner is identifying contradictions with class and consequently political antagonism, thereby repeating an old mistake of Bukharin and Trotsky.

In his books on "Historical Materialism" and "The Economics of The Transition Period," Bukharin identified contradiction with antagonism. Lenin wrote in the margin of the latter book:—

"Absolutely incorrect. Antagonism and contradiction are by no means the same. Under Socialism the first will vanish. The second will remain."

The driving force of every human society is the dialectical development of the productive forces of mankind, which, at a certain stage of the development of the productive forces, expresses itself in the form of class antagonisms.

We repeat "at a certain stage of the development of the productive forces," for there were no class antagonisms in primitive Communist society until a certain development of the productive forces had taken place, and there are no class antagonisms in Socialist society—if we except, in the very early stages of Socialist society the hangover from a previous stage, i.e., the resistance of the remnant of the dispossessed classes, allied with degenerated revolutionaries—a resistance that draws strength from the capitalist encirclement.

WILL CRUSH IT

The Soviet Government does not regard this resistance as being a driving force in the development

of Socialist society; has no intention of affording it legal or political expression, but, on the contrary, will ruthlessly crush it whenever it manifests itself.

What, then, are the contradictions that are specific to the first stages of Socialist society in the Soviet Union?

There is the contradiction between the still limited but constantly growing output of Socialist industry and agriculture, and the demands of the masses. Does this contradiction express itself in struggle?

It undoubtedly does, but not in class struggle. It expresses itself in the struggle of the Soviet workers to obtain a more complete satisfaction of their needs by the raising of the productivity of labour, both in industry and agriculture; by the struggle on the part of the workers and collective farmers to obtain a fuller utilisation of the technique at their disposal; by their struggle to enhance their technical competence.

No one can "allow" or "disallow" expression to this contradiction. It is there in the objective facts of social life. But the workers are resolving it in the manner above described.

Another contradiction is that between the Socialist organisation of production and petty-bourgeois and bourgeois habits in the minds of the workers in relation to production and work, in short, the survivals of capitalism in the minds of men.

This is being overcome by the development of Socialist methods of work—Stakhanovism—and by the Socialist re-education of the masses in schools,

in the factories and by the whole conditions of Socialist society.

Again, no one can stop this contradiction from expressing itself. It is expressing itself, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is mobilising the masses to resolve it. To suggest that because contradictions will exist in Socialist no less than in capitalist society that we should allow them to express themselves in political or social organisation—in this case, to allow the more backward workers to band themselves together in defence of petty bourgeois indiscipline and sloth—is surely a grotesque misunderstanding.

The contradictions of Socialist society will be most expeditiously resolved and the advance of Communism accelerated when the workers gather in iron unity behind the Bolshevik Party and go forward under its banner.

* * *

THE STATE

“Why do Communists keep referring to the capitalist State? In this country there is universal suffrage and the State is therefore in the control of the community and not in the control of the capitalists. If the people do not want a capitalist majority in the House of Commons they can clear them out at the next General Election?”—
S. S. (Hampstead).

WE use the term capitalist State because the present-day State has grown up and developed with the capitalist system and is an instrument in the

hands of the capitalist class for defending this system from the attacks of the workers.

It is true that there has been an enormous extension of the franchise in recent years, but the key positions in the State machine are still firmly in the grip of the capitalists.

Despite the extension of the franchise, the key positions in the Army, Navy and Air Force are filled almost entirely by capitalist elements. The extension of democracy has not led to facilities being created for workers to advance to be Army, Navy or Air Force officers.

The judges' posts are still filled from the same narrow circle of upper class lawyers. And judges not only administer the law, but by certain decisions can create what are virtually new laws.

The key positions in the diplomatic service are filled, generation after generation, by people drawn from a small and exclusive upper class group.

So with the key positions in the Civil Service We have frequently had the spectacle of high-placed civil servants accepting lucrative posts in capitalist industry when their time for retirement from the public service arrives. This argues close relations with big business during their tenure of office.

The class associations of the monarchy are too well known to require detailed description.

NOT NEUTRAL

It is clear that the State is not a neutral body, capable of serving the working class equally with the capitalist class. It is an organisation, the key points of which are in the hands of carefully chosen

guardians of capitalist interests. Such an organisation could not be used by the workers for purposes of the Socialist transformation of society.

When such Socialist transformation is attempted, it will provoke resistance from the officers in the forces, the high-placed bureaucrats, allied perhaps with Fascist forces outside.

It is therefore clear, to use the words of Karl Marx, that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machine and wield it for their own purposes." (Civil War in France.)

The workers will require to smash this capitalist State machine, replacing it by a Workers' State, in which all the key positions are held by the trusted representatives of the working class.

For the above reasons we are justified, in spite of the existence of universal suffrage, in describing the present State as the "Capitalist State."

We must not, of course, fall into the dangerous assumption that because of the capitalist essence of the modern State that it is a matter of indifference to the working class, as to whether the régime is democratic or Fascist.

Obviously the capitalist State in its democratic aspects gives the working class opportunities of organisation and agitation which are denied to it by Fascism. It is therefore necessary for the worker to defend these democratic rights.

Nor is it a matter of indifference as to what kind of Government is administering the capitalist State. There is a difference between a Labour Government administering the State to stem the growth of

reaction and to pursue a peace policy, and a National Government which puts through a reactionary policy at home and abroad. The National Government could strangle the development of working-class organisation. A Labour Government could create conditions for their development. The National Government encourages Fascism; a strong Government, based on the Labour and democratic forces, could suppress the Fascist organisations.

But this does not mean that a Labour and democratic Government could use the capitalist State as an instrument of social transformation. Only the smashing of the capitalist State and its replacement by a working-class State would render this possible.

* * *

TRADE UNIONS UNDER SOCIALISM

"Why is it necessary for trade unions to function in a Socialist State?"—C. R. (E.8).

OUR correspondent has doubtless in mind that trade unions are built up by the workers in capitalist society, in order to fight to secure better wages and conditions from an enemy class—the employers.

In Socialist Society, where industry is owned by the Workers' State, there is no enemy exploiting class—though members of the dispossessed exploiting class will of course exist as individuals and will be employed in various State Institutions. The need for maintaining vigilance with regard to these

elements has been illustrated by their recent counter-revolutionary activity in the U.S.S.R.

Nevertheless, the exploiting class as such has disappeared. Why, then, are trade unions necessary?

Lenin described the rôle of trade unions in a Socialist State as "schools of Communism."

The trade unions in Socialist society are the all-embracing organs of the working class. As such they consist of workers of all degrees of technical qualifications at all stages of political development.

The unions are, therefore, a link between the most advanced workers organised in the Communist Party, and the general body of the working class. They are schools of Communism because they train the workers to realise their dictatorship. They promote from their midst the best workers to carry out leading work in all branches of administration.

The unions do not in Socialist society confront an enemy class. Nevertheless in the early stages of Socialism there may be bureaucratic tendencies in a Socialist State which are a danger and against which the unions must fight.

Even if there are no bureaucratic tendencies it is necessary that the workers should have some organisation to represent them in discussing wages and conditions with the economic organs of the workers' State.

It is obvious that not all the wealth produced can be given to the workers in the form of wages. A portion of the social product must be devoted to improving and extending the equipment of industry and another portion for improved social services. It

is clear that the proportion of the product of industry that goes to wages; the share of the various sections of the workers in the general wages fund must be determined in discussion.

There is in Socialist society no differences or struggles between hostile economic classes. There can, however, be discussions as to how the wealth produced by Socialist industry is to be utilised in any given year.

The trade unions in the Soviet Union make annual collective contracts. The contracts for 1938 are being discussed at this moment.

In a Socialist society the unions are not merely concerned with the division of wealth. They are above all interested in ensuring that more shall be produced, because the greater the production the higher will be the standard of life.

The unions criticise the draft plans for any given period and submit amendments and suggestions (counter-plans) and in the light of these counter-suggestions the final plan is drawn up.

The working class in the Soviet Union is being continually reinforced by newcomers from the ranks of the peasantry, who will bring with them their peasant habits and prejudices. It is necessary for the advanced workers to re-educate those elements politically, while helping them to become technically more efficient. It is also necessary to struggle against the narrow craft union selfishness of certain workers who only see their own immediate interests unrelated to the general interests of the Socialist society.

“Capitalism inevitably leaves as an inheritance to

Socialism, on the one hand, old professional and craft differences created amongst the workers in the course of centuries; and, on the other hand, trade unions which only very slowly and in the course of years can and will develop into broader industrial rather than craft organisations (embracing whole industries and not merely crafts, trades and professions).

"These industrial unions will, in their turn, lead to the abolition of the division of labour between people, to the education, training and preparation of workers who will be able to do everything. Communism is moving in this direction; it must move and will now arrive at that goal but only after a great many years." (Lenin, *Left Wing Communism*.)

In addition to the above functions the trade unions in Soviet Russia direct all branches of social insurance, manage the innumerable rest homes and convalescent homes under their control, and have the entire responsibility for factory inspection. All these things are an expression of their essential function as "schools of Communism."

* * *

THE SOVIET TRIALS

"Do you not think that the trials in the Soviet Union are likely to have a deplorable effect on people who are sympathetic to that country?"—
E. H. (London, E.5).

THE effect that the trials will have on persons sympathetic to the Soviet Union depends on whether they view these trials in relation to the history and achievements of the Soviet Union, and on the basis of a careful analysis of the evidence, or whether they allow themselves to be influenced

by the gross misrepresentation of the capitalist Press.

It is not deplorable that people who are plotting terrorism, sabotage and treason against the Soviet Government, with a view to achieving the restoration of capitalism, should be punished. It would have been more than deplorable if they had got away with it.

If it is asserted that it is deplorable that there should be people in a Socialist State—discredited ex-leaders in the main—who plot against the Soviet Government, we may agree. But that there should have been resistance to the policy of the Soviet Government is inevitable.

The Soviet Government has eliminated capitalists, landlords, rich peasants and private traders at a time when these elements still dominate the policy of the capitalist Governments in the world outside.

The more such Governments declare their implacable hostility to the Soviet Union, as Germany, Italy and Japan have done, the more they raise the hopes of the ex-capitalists, landlords, rich peasants, traders and ex-Tsarist bureaucrats in the Soviet Union; the more these elements seek to weaken the Soviet Government, in view of the impending capitalist attack.

The Trotskyists, whose policy was based on the impossibility of building Socialism in the Soviet Union, were the natural mouthpiece of these people, who were, of course, against the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union or anywhere else for that matter.

When the Five-Year Plan began to develop, the Trotskyists declared that the Communist Party, under the leadership of Stalin, was leading the Soviet Union to a catastrophe, and that every advance in industrialisation or collectivisation would only accelerate the collapse of the Soviet Union.

It was during the years 1931-32, when the realisation of the Five-Year Plan began to encounter difficulties, that the Trotskyists in the Soviet Union came together again and began their preparations to overthrow the Government by large-scale terror and sabotage. The overthrow of the Government was necessary in order to lead an economic retreat to capitalism, which they asserted was desirable in order to prevent the country from being led to ruin.

From Trotsky's writings between 1929 and 1936 scores of passages could be cited predicting that Stalin was leading the Soviet Union to bankruptcy, chaos and civil war, when, in fact, the Soviet Union was developing Socialist industry at unprecedented speed, successfully collectivising agriculture and effecting a powerful, all-round improvement in the economic conditions of the workers and peasants.

When Fascism emerged in Germany, the Trotskyists, declaring that the defeat of the Soviet Union was already half accomplished, made terms with the Fascists, promising them help in the Fascist intervention, in return for the Fascists helping Trotskyism to power in a dismembered, defeated and vassalised Soviet Union.

The degeneracy of Trotskyism is the inevitable result of its basic principle, i.e., that to attempt to

build Socialism in the Soviet Union was to lead to ruin and chaos.

It is good that those who were acting on this basis entered into an alliance with Fascism, have been found out and punished. Genuine friends of the Soviet Union will not deplore this, but will glory in the fact that Socialism is triumphing over the enemy in its midst.

* * *

THE SOVIET UNION

"Is it true, as the 'Manchester Guardian' of November 8 declares, that Russia is now a National State, and is moving away from Communism and Internationalism?"—J. S. H. (Burnley).

THE Soviet Union is not a National State, but a multi-national State. The various nationalities in the Soviet Union are organised in 11 union republics, 22 autonomous republics, nine autonomous provinces, and these freely come together in the Soviet Union.

If by national State the *Guardian* means that the Soviet Union is only concerned with the protection of the peoples within the Union and has ceased to play any rôle internationally, this is a self-evident absurdity.

There has never been a time when the Soviet Union has played so great a rôle in international affairs as it is doing to-day.

It saved Spanish democracy in face of the sabotage of the parliamentary democracies in Western Europe. By direct assistance to the Spanish people and by

its fearless exposure of the pro-Fascist moves of the "Non-Intervention Committee," the Soviet Union has revealed to the world how a Socialist State can defend peace and democracy.

If anyone dared to say in Spain that the Soviet Union was a national State only concerned with the welfare of its own people and not concerned with the struggle of progressive humanity in other parts of the world, he would be laughed out of existence.

The Soviet Union is leading the fight for peace to-day. Without the Soviet Union the Western democracies could not resist the advance of the Fascist aggressors.

The other insinuation in the *Guardian's* remark is that Soviet Russia has abandoned the march of Communism. How often we have heard that story! We heard it when the peace of Brest-Litovsk was signed in 1918. We heard it when the New Economic Policy was introduced in 1921.

Ten years ago Trotsky and Zinoviev were accusing the Soviet Government of pursuing a policy which was promoting the growth of the capitalist traders in the towns, and of the rich peasants in the country, and was leading to the restoration of capitalism.

How grotesque that prediction reads to-day, when 92 per cent. of the peasant farms in the Soviet Union have been collectivised, when the rich capitalist peasants have been eliminated, when private trade has been completely abolished, when the whole economy of the country has become Socialist.

Still more absurd is the suggestion of the *Man-*

chester Guardian, made at the moment when the new constitution is opening the way to an unprecedented advance to Communism, that the Soviet Union has abandoned its aims.

* * *

SOVIET RUSSIA AND SPAIN

"Is it true as stated by Fenner Brockway in his pamphlet 'The Truth About Barcelona' that the Soviet Government laid down the following conditions before supplying the Spanish Government with arms:—

"1.—The expulsion of the P.O.U.M. from the Government and from all administrative offices.

"2.—Military control instead of workers' control of the armed forces.

"3.—The separation of the war from Revolution."?—Mrs. C. C. (Rutherglen).

THIS statement has been made on the authority of the friend of Trotsky, Andreas Nin—one of the prominent leaders of the Party of Marxist Unity.

Nin is now a fugitive from justice, on account of his co-operation with Franco Fascism.

The story is fantastic on the face of it. The Spanish Communists have never separated the civil war from the revolution. Victory in the civil war means the extension of the Popular Revolution in Spain. Defeat in the civil war means the liquidation of the Popular Revolution in Spain. The war and the Revolution are indivisible.

The Communist Party has declared that victory in the war and the Revolution demands the maintenance of the unity of the People's Front, on the basis of defence of the democratic Republic.

Remember that we are talking about a democratic republic of a new type—where the land has been taken from the landlords, where the factories and the banks are controlled by the People's Front Government, where a new educational régime is being developed.

It is this régime that the Trotskyists and the near Trotskyists designate as "counter-revolutionary."

According to these gentlemen the struggle in Spain is between the counter-revolutionary Governments. By this despicable lie the Trotskyists and the near Trotskyists seek to undermine international support for the struggle of the Spanish people.

The second alleged condition, "military control instead of workers' control of the armed forces," is too foolish for words.

The Spanish Communists have always stood for the creation of a regular People's Army, able to cope with all the problems of modern warfare.

POLITICAL CONTROL

The Communist Party has always insisted, however, on political control of the Army by the People's Front Government and the education of the soldiers in the spirit of the People's Front by the political commissars. There has been some dubiety among sections of the People's Front as to the value of political commissars, but the Communist Party has

insisted, in the words of Comrade Diaz, that:—

“The Commissars are the political soul of the Army, they are the ones who inspire it with heroism, who maintain its ideological understanding, who stimulate its faith and who, side by side with the officers, lead it to victory. In an army such as ours we cannot do without the Commissars nor decrease their rôle.” (Speech of Central Committee of the Spanish Communist Party held in Valencia, November, 1937.)

The P.O.U.M. was eliminated from the government in Spain because it opposed the policy of these governments. Obviously an impossible situation was reached when a party, whose representatives were participating in the government came out in resistance to the policy that the government was endeavouring to operate.

The P.O.U.M. resisted the formation of a People's Army, declaring:—

“We do not want any regular army, for this would signify the recognition of militarism; this would bring with it the introduction of the same methods and forms as the former army. All we want is the revolutionary militia.”

Nin, when he was still a member of the Catalan Government, declared in a public speech:—

“The men of the Popular Front are responsible for the civil war in Spain. . . . The Government that the people need is one in which the C.N.T. (i.e., the Anarchist Trade Union Federation) and the P.O.U.M. have a preponderance. . . . The future régime will come by arms, not from the ballot box.”

No Government could possibly tolerate the participation of an organisation openly preparing for its overthrow. No Russian advice was necessary to

convince the Spanish Popular Front Parties that the elimination of the P.O.U.M. was necessary in the interests of victory.

That this estimation was a thousand times correct was shown by the subsequent activity of the P.O.U.M. in the criminal Barcelona rising on May this year, and their subsequent proved co-operation with the Fascists.

THE I.L.P.

It should be noted that the I.L.P. and the Parties associated with it speculated at the beginning of the Spanish Civil War that the Soviet Union would not assist the Spanish people. This, we were told, was due to the desire of the Soviet Union to keep in the good books of the French and British Governments.

When the Soviet Union did assist, they then tried to explain that it was using its influence against the best interests of the Spanish people.

In all their turnings and twistings these people have one permanent principle: "The Soviet Union is always wrong." All their "criticisms" derive from this.

A NEW "ANSWER TO QUESTIONS" APPEARS EVERY DAY in the columns of the "Daily Worker." Because it solves a problem created by current events, it is most valuable *at the time it is printed!*

J. R. Campbell's column is only one current in the vital stream of Marxist thought and action flowing through its pages from men like Pollitt, Gallacher, Strachey, Dutt, Pitcairn and many others.

Books, theatre, music, cinema, radio, sports; the home, the garden, the children, are all there alongside the big news of the day.

Taking a useful part in life to-day means taking the "Daily Worker" regularly. It is a vital, living force—informative, entertaining, exciting—that nothing can replace.

If you are already a regular reader, the form on this page ought to be filled by one of your friends. Will you see to that?

I wish to become a regular reader of the "Daily Worker."

My name and address is:—

.....

.....

.....

My newsagent's name and address is:—

.....

.....

.....

(Post this slip in a $\frac{1}{2}$ d. envelope to "Daily Worker," Nelson Place, Cayton Street, London, E.C.1.)

CAMPBELL'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

are one of the most popular features of daily journalism. Ranging over the whole field of Readers' inquiries, practical, theoretical, 'teasers' and genuine difficulties, Campbell firmly, if at times a trifle ironically, and often humourously but simply, plainly replies, like a good boxer from a firm stance.

It is not debating; it is a tremendous effort to explain, to convince, to win over while there is yet time.

Questions here have echoes in all our minds. Reading the answers, the firm, basic lessons of Leninism become apparent: we, too, can become in our workshops and offices and on the street corners, Johnny Campbells.

For books to follow up the Answers write to—

LAWRENCE & WISHART
2 Parton Street, London, W.C.1