


AA0004279626






THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



THE I.L.P. AND THE 3rd INTERNATIONAL

Being the questions submitted by the
I.L.P. Delegation to the Executive of
the 3rd International and its reply,
with an introductory statement
by the National Council of
the I.L.P.

(Issued for THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY.)

NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, LTD.,
8 & 9, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London ;
30, Blackfriars Street, Manchester.

1920.

4357-8

1/- NET.

XVIII A 17 19

THE I.L.P.

AND THE

3rd INTERNATIONAL

Being the questions submitted by the I.L.P. Delegation to the Executive of the 3rd International and its reply, with an introductory statement by the National Council of the I.L.P.

(Issued for THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY.)

NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, LTD.,
8 & 9, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4. ;
30, Blackfriars Street, Manchester.

1920.



1513

INTRODUCTORY NOTES

by the

National Administrative Council of the
Independent Labour Party.

IN order that the members of the Independent Labour Party and others who are interested in Bolshevik Russia and in the reconstruction of the Socialist International should be in possession of authentic information on these subjects, the N.A.C. has decided to make available the documents published in this volume.

The N.A.C. had intended to publish with this Memorandum from the Executive of the Third International a report by Mr. Wallhead and Mr. Allen on their impressions of their visit to Russia. Owing to the serious illness of Mr. Allen it has not been possible to complete this report in time for publication in this volume, and as the N.A.C. consider that no delay should take place in putting the members of the I.L.P. in possession of the reply of the Moscow International, they have regretfully to postpone the issue of the report of their delegates. The N.A.C. sincerely hope that Mr. Allen may soon be sufficiently well to be able to complete the report.

The N.A.C. was instructed by the last Annual Conference of the party to get into communication with the Left Wings of the various national Socialist Parties, with those national Socialist Parties and groups which have seceded from the Second International, and with the Executive of the Moscow International. The Annual Conference rejected a proposal to join the Moscow International. It decided in favour of taking steps to re-unite in one all-inclusive International all parties which subscribe definitely to the Socialist objective, but insisted at the same time that the basis of the united International should permit the national sections to adopt their policies to the varying conditions of different countries.

The I.L.P. has never been lukewarm in its support of the Russian Revolution. It has opposed the Allied policy towards Russia since the Second Revolution. Without committing itself to approval or acceptance of all the deeds and theories of the Bolsheviki, it has regarded the Allied war upon Russia, the imposition of the blockade and support to the counter-revolutionary movement as an unjustifiable interference in the internal affairs of a free State, and as a capitalist and imperialist attack upon the greatest experiment in the history of the world to establish a new economic and social order.

Allied interference in the internal affairs of

Russia has deprived the world, up to the present, of the inestimable gain which would otherwise have come from the experience, whether of success or failure, of a great country attempting to practically apply the principles and system of Communism. Whether present conditions in Russia support or condemn Communism is not a question which can be decided on present facts, for no chance has been given to the Russian Communists to work out the practical application of their theories in free and unhampered circumstances.

But in considering whether the Third International is an organisation fitted for uniting the Socialist Parties of the world, and whether its theories, policies and practices are calculated to achieve Socialism in all lands, there are certain fundamental matters on which definite conclusions can be reached on the information contained in the Memorandum of the Third International, and apart from the question of the success or failure of Communism in Russia.

The matters on which British Socialists must make up their minds in considering the question of joining or rejecting affiliation with the Third International are :

The Dictatorship of one section of the International Socialist movement over the rest, or the refusal of that section to associate with other national Socialist

Parties except on terms imposed by itself.

The insistence by one section upon its policy and methods for the establishment of Socialism being followed in all countries.

The deliberate provocation of civil war (the disarming of the bourgeoisie and the arming of the proletariat) for the overthrow of capitalism.

The morality and practicability of a minority imposing its will upon an apathetic or helpless majority by what is called the Dictatorship of the Communist Party.

The morality and permanent value of suppressing the voice and influence of a minority, even during a revolutionary period.

The destruction of Parliamentary institutions and the forcible imposition by a minority of new forms of government and administration.

The adoption of methods of sabotage and disingenuous methods of propaganda inside existing Socialist, political, Labour and industrial organisations.

Whether the free use of denunciation and misrepresentation of Socialists who differ from the Communist leaders is to be the accepted method of Socialist fellowship.

We do not think it necessary to reply in detail to the points of the Memorandum of the Executive of the Moscow International which we publish in this volume. We can

trust the discriminating reader to discern the attitude and psychology of its authors. Though there is in parts of the document a disingenuousness which is obviously adopted to attract where a frank avowal would repel, it contains abundant evidence of the conviction of the authors that their doctrines, and policy and methods are held by them to be unimpeachable, and that Socialism cannot be found or realised except through their narrow dogmatism.

We would recommend the readers of the Memorandum to read it with the eight points we have enumerated in their minds, and judge the position of its authors on all these fundamental matters. Only by an understanding of the dogmatism of the Executive of the Third International, and by comparing their declared policy, methods and aims with our own is it possible to come to a conclusion as to whether union is possible and desirable.

The only points of detail in the Memorandum to which we feel compelled to call specific attention are the charges made against the German Socialists that they assassinated Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the vile insinuation that Henderson and Renaudel would do the same, and the infamous charges against Otto Bauer and F. Adler and the Austrian Socialists generally—men to whom so many Hungarian Communists owe their lives. These shameful

charges against men from whom we have differed throw an illuminating light on the mind and spirit of those who make them.

The N.A.C. is continuing its efforts to bring about the union of all genuine Socialists in an all-inclusive International, where unity on all essentials will prevail, and where there will be no dictatorship by one section, but freedom for all sections to work for the common objective of Socialism by adopting the national policy best suited to its own traditions, psychology, and economic and social development.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

(After a series of informal discussions with Lenin, Radek, and other leaders in Moscow, the I.L.P. delegation drew up a series of questions, which, as embodied in the following letter, were formally submitted to the Executive of the Communist International).

To the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Moscow, May 25, 1920.

At the last Annual Conference of the I.L.P. the following resolutions were adopted with regard to the International:

- (1) This Conference instructs the N.A.C. to withdraw from the Second International.
- (2) This Conference endorses the decision of the N.A.C. to invite the Swiss Party to arrange for a consultation regarding the possibility of the re-establishment of one all-inclusive International for the purpose of formulating a basis for an International which, while making a

quite definite announcement of our Socialist objective, would allow the national sections to adapt their politics to the differing political and industrial conditions in their various countries; after the enquiry and consultation are complete, a special Conference shall be called to consider the report.

The I.L.P. has therefore severed its connection with the Second International, has given instructions for enquiries to be made with regard to the exact programme and conditions of affiliation to the Moscow International, and has further invited the Swiss Socialist Party to arrange for a Conference of Left Wing Socialist Parties. When these enquiries are completed a special Conference will be held to decide the question of affiliation.

The I.L.P. desires to know whether the Third International has any formal constitution to which parties desiring affiliation are expected to subscribe. If so, the delegation would be glad to see a copy. In any case, will the Third International supply us with a written statement in reply to the following questions:

(1) To what extent does the Third International demand a rigid adherence in each country to the methods outlined in its programme?

(2) Will the Executive of the Third Interna-

tional state how they conceive the theory of "the dictatorship of the proletariat" as applied in Great Britain?

(3) To what extent does the Third International agree to the use of Parliamentary methods?

(4) What is the attitude of the Third International to the I.L.P. remaining affiliated to the Labour Party?

(5) Is the Soviet system of Government a fundamental principle of the Third International?

(6) If so, to what extent does the Third International recognise the possibility of diverse forms of Soviet government in different countries?

(7) Must societies affiliated to the Third International maintain that communism and the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be introduced by the use of armed force, or will they admit to membership parties that leave this question open?

(8) In what respect does the Third International consider that Communism differs from other forms of Socialism?

(9) Is it a condition of affiliation to the Third International that parties should accept Communism as defined in the answer to Question 8?

(10) Is the Third International willing to send representatives to the proposed Swiss Conference of Left Wing Socialist Parties?

(11) Is the Third International prepared to convene an International Conference to consider its programme, methods and constitution?

(12) If so, what would the basis of representation and voting power be at such a Conference?

R. C. WALLHEAD (Chairman),

CLIFFORD ALLEN

(Member of National Council).

Letter of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

*(Reprinted from the corrected English proof sheets
handed to R. C. Wallhead and Clifford Allen in Moscow)*

The Executive Committee of the Communist International, after its sessions held jointly with the above-named comrades for purposes of mutual information, has resolved to address the following letter to the workers organised into the Independent Labour Party, as a reply in their logical sequence to the questions put to it.

1. Communism and Other Tendencies in the Labour Movement.

The eighth question of our English comrades deals with the distinction between Communism and other forms of Socialism. Our best reply to this question will be to remind the British workers briefly of the history of contemporary Socialism from its birth to the time of its crisis, the period of the Imperialist war, and down to our days of the struggle for the realisation of the principles of Socialism.

Socialism arose as a striving of the working class to overthrow the capitalist system by means of revolutionary struggle, to abolish the system of private ownership of the principal means of production by the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to introduce a collective or social ownership of the means of production, which are to be developed for the welfare of the entire Labour society. Such was the Socialism of Marx and Engels as set forth in the "Communist Manifesto" and in other works of our great teachers of proletarian Socialism.

These works did not proceed from the imagination of the theoreticians of scientific Socialism, but they define the aims of the Labour movement by the experience of bourgeois revolutions, by the study of capitalism and the experience of the first great revolutionary movement of the working class, viz., the Chartist movement of the British workers. Contemporaneously with this proletarian revolutionary Socialism there existed various petty bourgeois philanthropic and even feudalist tendencies in Socialism, in other words, a great many efforts were made to subject the proletariat to the influence of other classes of society, to hold it back from the revolutionary struggle, deceiving it in the name of Socialism. From the very beginning Marx and Engels fought against all these adulterations of Socialism, revealing the truth

which was concealed behind the false banner.

When, after the failure of the revolution of '48, capitalism entered upon a period of further development, spreading and gaining new strength every day; when the idea of the direct seizure of power proved erroneous, Marx and Engels, boldly confronting the facts, indicated a method of preparing the working class for its future decisive revolutionary battles for power.

They pointed out to the working class that capitalism affords it the possibility of organisation and union, that it gives the advanced section of the working class the possibility of exercising its influence upon the backward sections, infusing into them the consciousness of the class solidarity of all the oppressed; they demanded from the class conscious workers that they should, without waiting for the final and decisive battle, utilise every possibility which had been forced from the capitalists for the establishment of legal open Labour Parties and for the organisation of Trade Unions, being guided by the principle that the working class will be able to utilise every capitalist crisis with the greater facility, the greater its unity, organisation and class consciousness will be.

They called upon the workers to fight for general franchise and democracy, in order that the masses might be able from the parliamentary tribune to tear the mask from every capitalist deceit, proving to the workers how

every kind of transaction and understanding between the various sections of capitalism is made at the expense of the working class. They called upon the workers to make use of the conflicts arising between the various sections of the capitalist class in order to secure economic and social reforms which would tend to ameliorate the position of the working class, to strengthen it and afford it an opportunity of making progress in its struggle against capitalism.

They called upon the working masses directly to take part in politics and to exercise direct pressure upon the bourgeoisie. They appealed to the working class never to forget that all this struggle for democracy, that all this struggle for reform, is only preparatory work whose aim is to strengthen the organisation and class consciousness of the workers, and to prepare them for the epoch of decisive battles with capitalism which is being torn by inner contradictions, by capitalism which will no longer be able to keep the masses in hand, but will, on the contrary, provoke revolutionary uprisings against itself.

But in the long process of the peaceful development of capitalism, the object of this preliminary struggle, of this organising period of struggle, was forgotten, the aim having become in the eyes of most of the leaders of the working class, and of a considerable number of the workers themselves, largely an aim

in itself instead of a means. Developing and enriching itself, as it does, at the expense not only of the proletarian masses of Europe, but also of the peasant masses of the whole world, of Asia, Africa and America, modern capitalism endeavoured to suppress the revolutionary strivings of the working masses by bribing the more developed and most intelligent section of the proletariat. The skilled workers, the best organised sections of the proletariat and the most indispensable to capitalism, secured during the course of thirty years prior to the world war a considerable improvement in its position. The opinion was current and growing amongst them that they would finally succeed in securing a human existence under capitalism without overthrowing this system of society. The struggle for the improvement of life had become to them not a means of revolutionary struggle, but an end in itself, and it is owing to this that even Socialism itself they see in no other light than as an accumulation of such partial reforms. These illusions of the Labour aristocracy who have not seen the deep poverty of the millions of unskilled workers, and who are left unaffected by the ruin and destitution caused to hundreds of millions of peasants of the whole world by the sharks of international capitalism, are being encouraged by the Parliamentary Labour representatives and by the Trade Union leaders.

Engaged in the musty atmosphere of Parliamentary work, witnesses of the base behind-the-scene transactions, conducting negotiations on behalf of the Trade Unions concerning petty concessions and compromises, these leaders have lost touch with the wide unskilled labour masses, with the toiling poor, they have become oblivious of the growth of capitalist exploitation and of the revolutionary aims of the proletariat. It seemed to them that because the capitalists treat them as equals, as partners in their transactions, the working class had secured equal rights with capital. Their own social standing secure and material position improved, they looked upon the world through the rose-coloured spectacles of a peaceful middle-class life. Disturbed in their peaceful trading with the representatives of the bourgeoisie by the revolutionary strivings of the proletariat, they were the convinced enemies of the revolutionary aims of the proletariat. They began to ridicule the aims of the working class, regarding them as symptoms of an infantile sickness in its development. The Second International, which they had established in this peaceful epoch of capitalism, in this epoch of the transition of proletarian revolutionary Socialism to the compromising reformist Socialism of the Labour aristocracy, largely accepted this point of view, although it verbally accepted all popular revolutionary phrases inherited

from the past, and which concealed this policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie by various high-sounding revolutionary phrases.

This reformist policy, which in England was represented by the Fabians, Ramsay MacDonald and Snowden, in France by Millerand and Jaurés, in Italy by Turati and Treves, in Germany by the reformists with Bernstein at their head, in Austria by Victor Adler, in Sweden by Branting, and in Denmark by Stauning, was combated by two other tendencies. One, which was headed by Karl Kautsky, fought against it verbally, drawing up resolutions of the principles of class war, which was daily growing more acute, protesting against the support to the bourgeoisie and the aggressive imperialist policy. When, however, the question reached the point of solution, Kautsky and his European friends always found a way out for the reformists to carry through their policy. Thus, for instance, at the moment of struggle against the first attempt of the treacherous policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie and of the subjection of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie, when Millerand joined the bourgeois Government of Waldeck-Rousseau Kautsky protested against this policy and against a coalition prejudicial to the proletariat; yet he consented to it on the ground of national danger, that is to say, in the event of war, refusing to see that war represents the

most concentrated, the highest form of exploitation of the proletariat in the criminal aims of the bourgeoisie. This International group of the "centre" of the Second International sank lower and lower, rendering the International position more acute. When after two Morocco crises, and after the 1908 Balkan crisis, which almost resulted in an international war, it became necessary openly to say to the proletariat that the moment for decisive battle was approaching, that it must of necessity increase its activity, that it must largely adopt the methods of general strike in order to stem the wave of the imperialist menace, and in order to prepare the force which might enable the proletariat effectively to oppose capitalism in the event of international war—this "centre," with Kautsky at its head, deceived the proletariat with agitating the possibility of disarming imperialism by compromise with the liberal bourgeoisie. Verbally adhering to the revolutionary methods of struggle, this "centre" actually fought against propaganda and agitation in favour of general strikes, substituting instead election bulletins and coalition with the bourgeoisie as a means to victory.

The second and weaker tendency in the Second International was represented by the extreme Left of Germany and by the Bolsheviks in Russia; these attempted in the years preceding the world war to make the

proletariat aware of the unprecedented danger threatening it by imperialism, and endeavoured to mobilise the proletariat for struggle by revolutionary methods. The difference between Communism and other tendencies in the Labour movement has been fully illustrated by the war. The Right Wing of the International, with President Vandervelde at its head, with Henderson in England, Renaudel in France, Scheidemann, Ebert and Legien in Germany, Bisolatti in Italy, Victor Adler and Renner in Austria, and the Mensheviks in Russia—this Right Wing entered into the service of the bourgeoisie and declared to the proletariat that its war-cry of “Workers of the world, unite” should be substituted during the war by the new cry of “Workers of all lands, cut each other’s throats in the interests of your countries.”

The Right Wing of the Second International understood by the phrase “defence of the country,” assistance rendered to the capitalists of one country to defeat the capitalists of another country, for the purpose of robbing them. These representatives of the Right Wing have, at a time of the extermination of the world’s proletariat by capital, become the favourites of the bourgeoisie of their respective countries; they joined the bourgeois ministries to render them assistance; standing on the mats outside the ministerial offices they persuaded the proletariat to strain all its forces

for war work and to fight to its last breath on the battlefield for its respective capitalists, making every promise that these capitalists would reward the proletariat upon the cessation of the war with every kind of political and social reforms. They helped the capitalists to deprive the workers of all the gains which they had secured in social legislation, organisation and freedom of strike, regarding the class struggle of the proletariat during the war as a crime against the fatherland. Thus they have proved themselves to be part and parcel of the capitalist state, of the apparatus of capitalist exploitation of the proletariat. Theirs is the guilt for the prolongation of the war and the unprecedented sufferings of the proletariat.

The "centre" of the Second International—at the head of which there stood during the war, in England MacDonald and Philip Snowden; in France Jean Longuet; in Germany Kautsky and Haase; in Italy Modigliani, Turati, Treves; in Russia, Axelrod, Martoff—protested in words against the war, expressed its dissatisfaction in words that the workers were forced to exterminate each other, while in deed the "centre" did not carry on any propaganda in favour of the proletariat's fighting against its oppressors, did not carry on any propaganda in favour of the proletariat's turning its guns against those who forced them to kill their brothers, the workers of other nationalities. The "centre" did not form

secret (illegal) organisations of the proletariat, did not organise demonstrations of the workers, did not call them to strike. The "centre" was in "loyal opposition" to the gang of world murderers and plunderers, and played in this war the rôle of Pontius Pilate, washing their hands of the guilt. Therefore, the bourgeoisie, although dissatisfied with the centrists, allowed them to remain at large, finding their protests useful as safety-valves for the dissatisfaction of the masses.

The third current, represented in England by Maclean and his friends, in France by Loriot, in Germany by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, in Russia by the Bolsheviki, branded the policy of the reformist Socialists of serving the bourgeoisie as treason to the working class. It branded the Pilate politics of the centrists, politics which disintegrates the energy of the working class; it formed illegal organisations, called the workers to street demonstrations, roused them to revolutionary action, to civil war against imperialist war. The bourgeoisie hunted down the representatives of this third—the Communist—group, as traitors to the fatherland; threw them into prisons and sentenced them to penal servitude—perfectly well aware of the fact that although weak at first, this group is the deadly enemy of the bourgeoisie.

In what manner are these three "forms of Socialism" distinguished? The first of them,

reformism, represented by the social compromisers, openly joined the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, helping the former whenever their aid was needed. In Russia, for a period of seven months, the Mensheviks and the so-called social revolutionaries bodily protected the interests of private property, the landlords and the capitalists, and also defended the interests of the French and British Stock Exchanges against the workers and peasants of Russia; moreover, they executed and shot down workers and peasants in the name of capitalist profits.

The German reformists, with Ebert, Scheidemann and Legien at their head, are now, for a period of a year and a half, standing up in defence of capitalism side by side with the bourgeois parties; they are responsible for the restoration of the defeated army of the German Kaiser. This army they have used as a weapon against the workers, whom they are fighting with trench-mortars and machine guns. At the same time they have been deceiving the masses with the assertions that the dictatorship of the capitalist counter-revolution means the supremacy of "democracy," and that the executioners of the proletariat are the defenders of the will of the people against the revolutionary minority which seeks to violate this will.

In England this Right Wing, headed by Henderson, is ready at any time to return to

the bourgeoisie, provided only that a working agreement might be possible with the further-seeing section of the bourgeoisie, the Independent Liberals. That they are not in the Government side by side with the jingoes with whom they sat during the war is only due to the fact that Bonar Law, Curzon and Churchill will not suffer their work to be disturbed by the loquacity to which these gentlemen (the Hendersons) feel impelled to resort under the pressure of the masses. These worthies who now talk of a Labour Government are but waiting the day when, having a Parliamentary majority, they will be able to invite to power the ex-Minister of War, Lord Haldane, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Fisher, and Mr. Asquith, that old fox of English Liberalism. For deep down in their hearts they, like Churchill, are convinced that the working class is unable to govern the country; for they, like Lord Fisher, wish by the aid of a Labour Government to save English capitalism from the Revolution.

In France Albert Thomas, who, when asked during the war by a representative of the Black Hundred *Novaya Vremia*, a reactionary Russian daily, regarding working class problems, declared that it was "guns, guns, more guns: that is what is needed." This Albert Thomas and his friend Renaudel wish for nothing more than an agreement with the Liberal bourgeoisie. They detest the govern-

ment of rabid reaction, as this kind of government prepares the ground for revolution. Confronted with the bandit attacks of the Allies upon the Labour Republic, these right Socialists of France and England never went a single step further than did such Liberal newspapers as the *Daily News* and *Manchester Guardian*, limiting their work to protest against intervention, restraining the workers from rising—the only effective form of protest. They even prevented the protest strike of July 21, 1919, when the hordes of Denikin, Yudenitch and Koltchak, maintained by British and American gold, attacked Russia of the Workers and Peasants. German Social Democracy organised a crusade against Soviet Russia by sending its bandit detachments into Lettland to fight the Lettish proletariat.

The whole policy of the Right Wing of the Second International after the war consisted of an open crusade against the working class. For this purpose the German Right Wing went so far as to resort to the assassination of the revolutionary leaders, Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Leviné, and if Renaudel and Henderson from time to time even showed their disapproval of this kind of action, they never failed at the same time to defend the Second International; that is to say, they co-operated with the butchers, Noske and Scheidemann. This only proves that they are fully prepared to repeat the same thing in their own countries to-morrow.

What is the Centre of the Second International doing after the war? In England the Centre, in the persons of MacDonald, Snowden, and of the majority of the I.L.P., aids the Right Wing by persuading the workers that Socialism can only be obtained by constitutional means; that is to say, by making use only of those rights which the bourgeoisie concedes to the working class, while retaining the real power in its own hands. The Centre protests against the bloody execution by British Imperialism of the Irish, Egyptian and Indian workers and peasants; but it carries on no kind of agitation amongst the British soldiers and sailors, who are tools in the hands of Lord French, Allenby and General Dyer. It exerts itself to restrain the workers from bringing direct pressure on the capitalists, thus making itself the chief obstacle to the revolution.

In France, in the person of Longuet, it likewise attempts to restrain the workers from revolutionary activity, considering it quite sufficient to fill the air with revolutionary phrases. In Germany at the beginning of the revolution the "Centre" actually, openly, and in conjunction with the Scheidemanns, assisted the capitalists to restore their power, and at the time when it was represented in the Government, refrained from destroying the old bureaucratic and military apparatus; by means of its deceitful democratic phrases

it stole the power of the Workers' Councils, preventing their communication with Soviet Russia. Compelled by their own members to quit the Government, the Independent Social Democracy of Germany attempts, in the person of its leaders during every revolutionary manifestation, to restrain the masses, putting forth perfunctory and misleading slogans, as, for example, the slogan of "coalition" between the Soviets and the bourgeois Parliament; and, later, the slogan of "Labour Government," wherein the workers are to be represented by the Crispiens and Legiens of the trade union bureaucracy. In Italy the leaders of this Centre, such men as Treves, Turati and Modigliani, remain in the Italian Socialist Party which evidently is a Communist Party, for the sole purpose of restraining the working class from action at every decisive moment, and of misrepresenting in Parliament the clear, definite revolutionary will of the workers. In Austria these leaders of the Centre, with Otto Bauer and Friedrich Adler at the head, go hand-in-hand with Renner, this cleverest of compromisers, and support the Coalition with the reactionary anti-semite, so-called Christian "democracy"; there they sold arms to the Czech white guards who fought against Soviet Hungary, and are now selling arms to the Polish white guards against Soviet Russia. This traitorous policy they justify by the statement

that there is no room in Austria for the class struggle, it being necessary to stand upon the threshold of the capitalist Entente, and, like beggars, hat in hand, to ask for crumbs. They have substituted the militant banner of Socialism for the shreds and tatters of beggary.

At the same time the Communists have managed, by dint of their self-sacrificing, energetic defence of the interests of the proletariat and the poorest peasantry, to assume the leadership of vast, populous Russia; they have succeeded in snatching the government power from the hands of the bourgeoisie and its lackeys, to establish the first Proletarian State, to defend it during the course of two and a half years; to create a Red Army as a weapon against the attack of the capitalists of the whole world; and, in spite of incredible sufferings of the masses, to lay the foundation of a Communist order.

In Germany the Communists have during this time organised an advance guard of the proletariat, infusing into it the spirit of a life-and-death struggle, they themselves perishing in prisons, sacrificing their lives in open battle, falling victims to the capitalists' hired assassins; they defend the banner of Communism with their own bodies, and have created in the working masses of Germany, sorely disappointed in the Social Democratic leaders, a new will to save sixty millions of

the German people who have been condemned by the Kaiser's policy and by that of German capitalism, as well as by the bandit policy of Allied capital, to death by starvation—to save these people by means of a proletarian revolution and by uniting them with the Russian proletariat under the common banner of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Communists of Hungary, a young and resolute party, dared take upon their shoulders the defence of the toiling masses of Hungary at a moment when there was but one alternative—to enter the life-and-death struggle or to put their necks into the noose of the Entente capitalism. Under inconceivably difficult conditions they were the first to set an example of Socialist land-settlement; for three months they defended themselves, and, overcome by the deceit and the intrigues of treacherous compromisers, they were shot down by the Roumanian nobility armed against them by the Allies and by English executioners like Horthy; there is no doubt whatever that their sufferings and struggles have deeply sown in the hearts of the Hungarian proletariat faith in the possibility of struggle. The bloody baptism to which the Hungarian magnates, supported by international capital, subjected the workers will only complete their education, and will strengthen their awful will to conquer under the banner of Soviet Hungary.

Under incredibly difficult economic conditions the Communists of Poland, in a country ruined to the end by war, hinder by constant demonstrations the new war of the Polish white guards against Soviet Russia at a time when "the Polish Socialist Party," which belongs to the Second International, is, in the person of Pilsudsky, making attempts in the interests of international capital to achieve that in which the white generals of the Tsar have failed, namely, the defeat of Soviet Russia.

The Communists of Bulgaria have gathered round them by their determined struggle against the war, by their resolute defence of the interests of the proletariat, all the revolutionary elements of the country, and at the present moment stand upon the threshold of a most decisive fight for the power. Hand-in-hand with them are the Communists of Serbia who, on the outbreak of hostilities, were the only ones who, together with the Russian Bolsheviks, had the manhood and courage to protest from the Parliamentary platform openly against the war. At the present time they are developing a parallel action with the Bulgarian Communists, by mutual efforts to take into their own hands the solution of the Balkan question, and to deprive international capital of the possibility of making use of the struggle of nationalities in the Balkans to incite new international wars.

In Italy the Communists at the head of the daily-growing millions are carrying on an offensive against the stronghold of capitalism. The gaining wave of strikes and demonstrations shakes this, and unites the labouring masses for the revolt. The agitation for, and the establishment of, Soviets is preparing the victory of Soviet Italy.

The Communists of France are struggling in the ranks of the French party against the deceitful policy of Longuet; are preparing the advance guard of the French proletariat to take the leading part, when the French masses will realise how they have been deceived by their bourgeois leaders with cries of victory; when these impoverished masses will present their bill of costs to the bourgeoisie.

The Communists of America prove by their long prison terms to which the bourgeois sentences them for Communist agitation and propaganda what capitalist democracy really means; they are tearing the mask from it, and are exposing it before the masses as a reign of trust-kings and speculators amid the subjection of the masses. In the whole range of the wide world—in South Africa and Mexico, in Australia and the Chinese ports—the Communists are the soul of that section of the working class to take the power into their hands. Communism everywhere is the guiding star in the struggle against capitalism.

To the question of the British I.L.P., " In what respect does Communism differ from other forms of Socialism? " we reply: There are no other forms; there is only Communism. Whatever else goes under the name of Socialism is either wilful deception by the lackeys of the bourgeoisie or the self-delusion of persons or groups who hesitate to choose between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; who hesitate between a life-and-death struggle and the rôle of assistants to the expiring bourgeoisie.

2.—The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the British Proletariat.

The second question of the representatives of the I.L.P. to the Communist International is to explain how in its opinion is the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat to be applied in Great Britain. We consider that in no country can the dictatorship of the proletariat be applied better, more directly than in Great Britain.

The capitalist system dominant in England has been created by the most merciless capitalist dictatorship. English capital has by violence deprived the peasants of their land. Beginning with the 16th century, it forced the peasants from their lands to establish a system of capitalist ownership in land. Peasants and craftsmen who, by force of economic conditions had become prole-

tarianised, had in a most dictatorial way been turned into the wage slaves of capitalism, and had their ears and nostrils cut when they refused to work. They were driven by capitalism into workhouses, which were houses of starvation and death; husbands were separated from their wives, and children from their mothers, and forced to toil without rest in the interests of capital. Workmen were being sent to the gallows when, ruined by the factories, they attempted to destroy the machines, failing to understand that the evil was not in the machines but in capitalist ownership. Workers who assembled peacefully to demonstrate their dissatisfaction were shot down, as happened at Peterloo in 1819. Hundreds of the best representatives of the English working class have perished in prison when, at the time of the Chartist movement, they have attempted to raise the English proletariat to fight for their emancipation. From the time of Cromwell, Clive and Warren Hastings to the time of Dyer, Allenby and French, with arms in hand, they have crushed under their iron heel the peasant masses of Ireland, India and Egypt, pitting one section against another in order to strengthen their own domination, every attempt at insurrection being drowned in blood.

There is no other capitalism in the world which had attained and maintained its power through so merciless, so bloody a dictator-

ship. If the mendacious historians of the British bourgeoisie are able to convince a considerable part of the British workers that the domination of the British bourgeoisie represents a peaceful domination, and a domination of the people—that England knows no revolutions and that the English people enjoy constitutional rights to realise every kind of reform desired by the majority—this brazen lie is still current only because the labour aristocracy of the British working class has for 50 years and over forgotten the turbulent history of English capitalism and the revolutionary record of the English labouring masses. The moment the majority of the English people will turn against it, the ruling clique will relegate Parliament to ash-heaps of oblivion, and will institute in England the same dictatorship of French and Churchill which it has established in Ireland. This clique, ready to discard the Parliamentary bauble, is already preparing for a policy of blood and iron.

When Churchill asserts that the working class, that the Labour Party is incapable of leading England, that means to say that any Parliament with a Labour majority really intending to fight the bourgeoisie will be dispersed with the aid of the expeditionary forces and of the white guard of the bourgeoisie. Such a Parliament he will declare “incapable of governing England.” Churchill’s circular

of February, 1919, the intent of which is to prepare the use of military force against the workers in the event of strikes, goes to show that the English military clique does not for a moment think of drawing any distinction between its English, its Egyptian, Hindu or Irish slaves.

Whoever tells the British working class that it can overthrow the capitalist dictatorship in the British Empire, through any other means than the dictatorship of the proletariat—that is, by taking the full power into their own hands by depriving of political power all those who defend capitalist exploitation and by organising a Red Labour Army—deceives himself and others. It is possible to think that the working class in England can secure Government power even without a revolution by means of Parliamentary election victories. The world revolution knows various stages, as that, for instance, of the Hungarian workers who received the Government power without insurrection and without armed collisions, owing to the capitulation of the Karolyi Government. The Russian working class has gained power not so much owing to the application of armed force as to the fact that the armed forces of the country have gone over to their side.

When the point in question is the dictatorship of the proletariat the formal way in which the proletariat will acquire power is of no

importance ; what does count, however, is the fact that the working class can neither protect nor maintain this power unless the capitalist class is disarmed, and unless it is deprived of its political rights until the time arrives when it can be included in the ranks of the labouring people ; unless the source of all the forces and wealth of the country is concentrated in the hands of the working class, whose power must be protected at all costs.

Had the British working class gained power by means of Parliamentary elections, by means of so-called democracy, which, under the existing conditions of the concentration of the means of forming public opinion in the hands of the bourgeoisie is most unlikely, even in that case the Communists are not for a minute freed of their duty of saying to the workers the following: (1) that it is most unlikely that the English bourgeoisie, the most energetic and most skilful oppressor of national movements, the richest in the world, the ruler not only of millions of British workers but of hundreds of millions of the peasants and the workers of its colonies, it is most unlikely that this bourgeoisie will give up its power without a struggle and become subject to the paper will of the Parliament; (2) that, therefore, the workers should prepare not for an easy Parliamentary victory, but for victory by a heavy civil war; (3) that

should the workers have succeeded in gaining power without this civil war, that would only signify that the necessity of civil war would confront the working class so soon as it will set out to realise its will to defend itself from capitalist exploitation and speculation; so soon as it will begin to liberate the masses in the colonies, now oppressed by British Imperialism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the more applicable in England in that the proletariat forms the greater part of the population, that it is on a high level of technical and general education, and that it is organised in strong trade unions. It only requires a firm revolutionary will and the establishment of a resolute revolutionary party, which will be able to express and to effect and to spread this will amongst the millions of the working masses.

This is a reply not only to the second but also to the seventh question of our English comrades—the question whether the dictatorship of the proletariat can be introduced otherwise than by armed force.

3.—Soviets and Parliament.

Our English comrades have put the question to us whether the acceptance of the Soviet system is obligatory for the members of the Third International. To this we shall reply by a slight excursion into the history of

the English bourgeois revolution. When, at the time of the English revolution, the Independents, who represented the richest bourgeoisie and the capitalist landlords, became a conservative power, resisting further reforms demanded by the national army, Cromwell, in 1653, under the pressure of the army, declared: "The time has come; I must act." He made a Parliamentary speech dwelling on the policy of greed and rapacity of the propertied classes; he was told that that was not a constitutional speech. Cromwell replied: "You think this is not Parliamentary language. I want to put an end to your Parliamentary speeches. I say to you that you are no longer a Parliament. Bring them in." And in were led the revolutionary soldiers, and the Parliament of the Independents was dispersed.

Revolution is a struggle of classes; and the more acute the struggle is the sharper the antagonism of class interests. Being a life-and-death struggle, a civil war, an armed combat, the revolution tolerates no delusive institutions; the discussions and speeches are intended to conceal the nature of the current events from the masses. The clearer the masses see into the progress and objects of the revolution, the stronger it grows if helped by the revolutionary Government. Revolution, therefore, has no need for deceitful institutions, the aim of which is to deaden

the class struggle by speeches. More than that, revolution has no time for speeches; it has to act, and to act rapidly. This is the reason why Cromwell was compelled to disperse the Parliament of the Independents. He formed the small Parliament of craftsmen, farmers and tradesmen. This small Parliament, which was the representative of the principal power of the revolution, of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie, and a weapon in the hands of the masses, was nothing but a Soviet or Council of the representatives of the integral parts of the English Revolutionary Army. And for the very reason that Cromwell was connected with the bourgeoisie, with part of the landlord class and with the generals, he was subsequently compelled to disperse this Parliament also, for the reason that, as he explained, it violated the rights of freedom and property. If a man possessed twelve cows it was the opinion of the Covenanters that this man should share them with those of his neighbours who possess none; no man would have any property if these people remained in power. This Parliament had, therefore, also to be dispersed.

Revolution, like counter-revolution, like every active revolutionary social group, cannot indulge in speeches but must act. At the time of the French revolution the Jacobins gained a victory under the banner of democracy. The Constitution of '93 was

democratic—it was one of the most democratic constitutions—but in order to protect the masses against the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and landlords and against the European counter-revolution, the Jacobins were compelled to expel from the Parliament the Girondists, and to deprive the counter-revolutionary classes of all electoral rights. They did not do this on paper; they did so actually.

The proletarian revolution, it is obvious, does not imitate bourgeois revolutions; differs from them both in form and nature. But the proletarian revolution must act not less but more resolutely than the bourgeois revolution, because a proletarian revolution represents a *coup d'état* infinitely greater than all the bourgeois revolutions taken together. Bourgeois revolution substituted one form of private property for another; the proletarian revolution abolishes private property and evokes infinitely more hatred, malignancy and resistance. Under the modern means of transit and communication all the counter-revolutionary forces of the world rally against the proletarian revolution, and, therefore, delay is most destructive to the cause. The proletarian revolution is, therefore, compelled to act swiftly and resolutely, and must not indulge in lengthy disputes with the counter-revolution.

The counter-revolution, as has been proved

by the Finnish, Russian, Hungarian and German experience, is not less determined. It refuses to speak to the revolutionary workers, making instead every effort to destroy them by starvation and bullets; therefore, even had the British workers acquired power and failed immediately to deprive the bourgeoisie of its political rights and expel it from Parliament, there is no doubt whatever that they would soon be driven to do so if they wished at all to utilise their power for their own liberation. But if they do expel the bourgeoisie from Parliaments, the municipalities, and so forth, then these would become organs of the working class. If it were so, then the question would arise as to the method of elections, namely, whether it would be a Labour parliament, and municipality elected territorially or industrially. The territorial principle represents election by the population of the districts. This was the most suitable method of election for the bourgeoisie, for if the Parliament as a whole was to create an impression that it represents the entire nation, then the elections had to be conducted on the territorial principle, without distinction of classes. But the Labour parliament, the Labour municipalities, have no intention whatever of creating false impressions. It is their express intention that the population know definitely who compose them and whom they represent;

and, therefore, election by the various branches of industry—factories, shops, and organised employees, professional classes and agricultural workers—working on a collective basis, is the principle of elections most suitable to Labour democracy.

The Labour deputies should be connected with a definite industrial group. They must be under its direct influence and control, and the masses should be enabled to recall them at any time. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the epoch of capitalist concentration is bound up with the Soviet system, for capitalism has concentrated the workers into big industries, and this concentration is a source of revolutionary energy which manifests itself in the manner of elections. Bourgeois democracy sought to pitch the Parliamentary clique against the formless electors. Labour democracy is based on the closest contact of the Labour representatives with the masses by whom they are delegated, and on the right of recalling the deputy if the policy of the latter does not correspond to the view of his constituents. Labour democracy demands a Soviet system of elections by factories, shops, and the various branches of industry.

When the Communists in Russia put forward the slogan of "All power to the Soviets," they as yet had no idea whether this would be the form of proletarian dictatorship in other countries. The revolutions in Ger-

many, Hungary and in Poland prove that everywhere the workers strive to establish their dictatorship on the principles of the Soviet system as most suitable to their interests; there is a universal distrust of bourgeois parliamentarism, a distrust of social democracy which has sold the masses, a distrust which is now being expressed in the attempts of the masses to take the government power into their own hands through their representatives, and to exercise a constant control over them.

Our English comrades in their sixth question wish to know what other forms of Soviet government are possible in other countries. We can say nothing definite. It is necessary to admit theoretically the possibility of variations of forms depending upon the varying economic structures of the different countries in a state of revolution. It must, however, be said that the experience of the development of the world revolution until recently has given no indications of the realisation of this theory. It is the opinion of the Communist International that it is not its concern to indicate the exact form in which revolution is to develop.

The watchwords of the Communist International are, of course, based on the experience of the present level of the world revolution; they are in no way to be observed as if they were the dictates of religion but are to

change in accordance with new experience. The thing that is important is that the masses should understand that without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, without its disarmament and the complete eradication of its economic power, the victory of Socialism is impossible; that to effect this it is necessary that all the power be in the hands of the workers, i.e., of a class which is realising the revolution, and that the power of this class is to be expressed in Labour organisations, both in the central cities as well as in the localities, representing Labour bodies which are fully dependent upon the mass of the workers, and the representatives of which can be recalled at any time.

4.—Words and Deeds in the Communist International.

Quite a number of questions of our English comrades, including the first, seventh and the ninth, deal with the attitude of the Communist International towards its affiliated parties, the application of the Communist programme and Communist views. We are able to give clear and concise replies.

The programme of Communism is a formulation of the general conditions for the development of the world revolution in capitalist countries. The bourgeoisie cannot be defeated without civil war in any of these countries. Nor is it possible to conduct civil war successfully without the organisation of

the proletariat as the ruler of the country; that is to say, the organisation of proletarian dictatorship; this dictatorship of the proletariat is to be based on workers' Government organs—the Soviets.

Since the programme of Communism is not the work of the imagination of the founders of the Third International, but is a method of struggle meeting the general conditions of the development of the world revolution, it is self-evident that only that party can be a member of the Communist International which is ready to imbue the whole of its propaganda, agitation and its entire policy with the resolute spirit and comprehension of the conditions of the struggle which find their expression in the programme of the Third International. The Communist International can permit no discrepancy between words and deeds. Moreover, one of the symptoms which marks the decay of the Second International was that it admitted into its ranks parties which in reality had nothing in common with Socialism, as was the case with the Labour Party of England, which was established *en bloc* with the trade unions for the pursuance of specifically concrete political objects, and not for the struggle for Socialism.

The Second International also admitted parties within its ranks whose practise was avowedly hostile to the interests of Socialism.

Since the majority of the parties comprising the Second International was, by very nature and substance Reformist, fighting for Socialism only in words, there was nothing binding upon its members; everything was tolerated. To this it must be added that since the struggle of the Second International was carried on principally in Parliaments, and was one of negotiations around a table between trade union leaders and leaders of capitalists combined, this struggle had to reckon with a great variety of social groupings.

With the development of the world revolution, in all advanced capitalist countries we see the propertied classes forming themselves into one great counter-revolutionary mass, submerging all differences between the various capitalist groups. The centre of the struggle is transferred to direct encounters between Capital and Labour. That is to say, the conditions of the struggle are, with the growth of the world revolution, becoming identical in every country. This makes possible the unification of the revolutionary tactics of the workers. Thus is created a basis for a firm and general policy of all the parties which conscientiously join the Third International. There are leaders of various parties who, under the pressure of the rank and file, are forced to admit the possibility that the time will come when they will have to join the Third International. These leaders are

opposed to the revolutionary methods of the Communist International, and make false allegations against it, alleging that it forces upon the workers of other countries a revolutionary policy and definite methods of action decided upon in Moscow. In reality they fear that their own workers will impose upon them these revolutionary methods, and, compelled to admit the possibility that it will be necessary to join the Third International, they already try to secure for themselves a free hand for their opportunism by appealing to the Communist International to deal with the specific conditions under which they work—all of which means nothing but to be allowed to stand by the Third International in words, while in deeds they carry on a policy of indecision and vacillation between the revolutionary proletariat and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

The Communist International cannot—and absolutely refuses to—admit within its ranks representatives of parties which still confide in those whose words and deeds do not coincide. It says openly to the workers joining its ranks: You are able to carry out the policy of the Communist International only in so far as you are able decisively to break with those leaders who either consciously deceive you or, afflicted by their own contradictions, mislead themselves. Only if freed from such will the workers be able to carry out the policy of the Third International in fact.

When such workers represent in a given party only a section of its members, only a minority, we are justified in saying to them openly: We welcome you as brothers, but we call upon you to fight for the affiliation of your party with the Communist International, not by obtaining the unwilling consent of your leaders to join it, but by means of determined propaganda within your own party to rid yourselves of the opportunist leaders of the Right. The Communist International as a militant organisation wishes to know definitely upon what forces it can rely, which parties it may depend upon as its loyal battalions. It in no way wishes to create a false impression of forces; it internationally refuses to accept into its ranks any party unless the inner structure of that party is characterised by a membership of revolutionary temper, and is free from leaders of opportunist tendencies who at the decisive moment are likely to turn the helm and consequently the party into the backwater of compromise with the bourgeoisie.

5.—The Communist International and the Utilisation of Parliament.

To the third question of the English comrades concerning the extent to which the Communist International agrees to the use of Parliamentary methods, the Communist International has already given an answer in a number of documents. The Communist

International does not look upon Parliament as an organ fit for the exercise of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or as a possible instrument of its power. The Communist International does not believe that it is possible for the proletariat to secure its victory by receiving a majority at the Parliamentary elections, although there is no doubt that such a majority, indicating that most of the people are for Communism, could, as a means of propaganda, aid the final victory of the proletariat. But in a country where the working class is just beginning its struggle for power, the Communist International not only considers it admissible but desirable and even obligatory to utilise the election campaign as well as the Parliament for the purposes of Communist propaganda and organisation.

Where the workers have not seized power as yet, where their Press is weak, where this Press extends only to a part of the proletariat, where the Communist organisation is often driven underground—in such places there is comparative freedom at election time, and should the workers *acquire power then* the Parliamentary tribune can prove most serviceable for revolutionary propaganda and organisation. The policy of the Bolshevik faction in the Third Duma, the policy of the Bolsheviks at the Democratic Conference, have proved the usefulness of the Parliamentary tribune for Communist agitation, as has

also been proved by the practice of Karl Liebknecht in the German Reichstag in the blackest days of German reaction. But the revolutionary methods of utilisation of Parliamentarism are distinct from the opportunist methods.

The opportunist Labour leaders go into Parliament in order to secure improvement in the position of the Labour aristocracy by compromising with the bourgeoisie.

Revolutionary Communists, on the other hand, if they enter Parliament at all, make it their business to expose the bourgeoisie before the working masses by all the means in their power, from speeches to Parliamentary conflicts, all the time drawing the attention of the working masses to the issue of the struggle. They make it their task, by their manifestations, to compel the bourgeois Press to take notice of the aspirations and strivings of the Communists, thus bringing the wide masses of the poorer stratum of the proletariat, who do not read Communist papers, in touch with the Communist leaders and Communist ideas. They make it their task to assist the working masses to organise, to establish legal, and, if need be, illegal, organisations. Their work, therefore, represents only an auxiliary organ of the Communist work among the masses. Their agitation should be directed to provoke mass movements, to the support of such movements, and

their defence before the whole world from the Parliamentary tribune.

The Parliamentary Communist fraction should, therefore, be entirely subordinated to the Communist party, to the leading organ of the revolutionary mass struggle, and to the Central Committee of the party as the leading organ of the latter. The very fact that the working masses of Europe and America are acquainted only with the opportunist use of Parliament; the fact that they only saw the corruption of Parliamentarism perishing on the barricades; this fact alone makes difficult the realisation of the policy of the Communist International in this field. We are, however, firmly convinced that the working masses, which are often driven from the extreme of Parliamentary stupidity of the opportunist leaders to the camp of naïve anti-Parliamentarism, will finally come to see the sound policy of the Communist International.

6.—The Communist International and the Labour Party.

The fourth question of the English comrades demands an answer concerning our attitude towards the fact of affiliation of the I.L.P. with the British "Labour Party." This question confronts not only the I.L.P. but also the B.S.P., which belongs at one and the same time both to the Third International and to the "Labour Party." The answer to this

question is very difficult, because it demands not only a detailed knowledge of the dynamics of English politics but also an estimation of the future of the "Labour Party." From the material which we have succeeded in collecting on this subject, we have arrived at the following view.

The "Labour Party" was established, not as an independent political party, but as an alliance of parties, trade unions, and other labour organisations for the purpose of creating a Parliamentary Labour representation at elections, to protect the interests of the trade union organisation of the British workers against the attempts of British capital to check the trade union movement. The majority of the delegates of the Labour Party consisted of Liberal-Labour politicians. At the time of the Campbell-Bannerman-Asquith Government the Labour Party lagged behind the Liberal party. Since that time the Socialist movement has grown amongst the British working class, which in its turn has added strength to the Socialist elements of the Labour Party. Owing to the weakness of the British Socialist parties, the central and vital question was that of their connection with the trade unions and the labouring masses. They were compelled to join the "Labour Party." The fact that the "Labour Party" was not a political party with a definite programme, with definite

tactics binding upon all its members, that it had neither local organisations nor a daily Press dealing with its policy, made it comparatively easy for the various Socialist parties to belong to it.

At the present moment there is a tendency of the opportunist leaders to make the Labour Party a real party with local organisations and a programme. They aim to create a large opportunist party which is to retard the revolutionary development of the masses. If this tendency were to succeed the Labour Party would never afford the Socialist organisations which form part of it the right to an individual Communist policy, nor to the propagation of the revolutionary struggle. It would bind their freedom of action hand and foot. It is thus evident that no kind of organisation seeking to carry out a Communist policy could possibly belong to the Labour Party. It would then become necessary, after a most energetic struggle against this tendency, to leave the Labour Party and to endeavour to keep in touch with the working masses by means of increasing the Communist activity in the trade unions, by detaching these trade unions from the Labour opportunist parties and persuading them to go over directly to Communism.

We, however, consider affiliation with the Labour Party admissible in so far as it represents a *bloc* of organisations each free to carry

on propaganda according to its own programme. Affiliation should not mean a mechanical utilisation of the party for the purpose of keeping in touch with the masses gathered under the roof of the Labour Party—but a striving to free the masses from the influence of the opportunistic leaders of the Labour Party. The policy which the I.L.P. pursued with regard to the Labour Party during the war and during the election campaign in December, 1918, we consider inadmissible.

During the war the I.L.P. was not in favour of supporting British Imperialism, but it failed to carry on propaganda for its ideas. It failed to prove to the working masses that they were and are being betrayed by their leaders. Affiliation with the Labour Party then meant an alliance with opportunism—and in no wise a struggle against it. During the election campaign, as far as their personal views and temperaments went, the candidates of the I.L.P. more or less sharply criticised the Government's war policy, yet the party as a whole failed to point out to the masses that the Labour Party as a whole was, because of its support of the Government, responsible for the war, that its guilt was as great as that of the Imperialist Government. We cite the following example to the parties which are at one and the same time part of the Third International and the Labour Party.

At the time when the Russian Communists, being in a minority, were represented in the Soviets (Councils) along with the Menshevist majority, they never for a single moment abandoned their energetic struggle against the policies of this majority, mercilessly exposing them as traitors to the proletariat.

Such a policy towards the Labour Party we consider to be a condition for affiliation with the Third International.

7.—The Communist International and the Elements of the Centre.

The last three questions of our English comrades refer to our attitude towards the attempts at compromise with these elements which have left the Second International, and have not joined the Third International. These elements do not represent a homogeneous mass. For example, the Party in Switzerland:

As far as the Right Wing leaders of the Swiss Party are concerned, who by means of a referendum have sabotaged the decision of the Party Congress to affiliate with the Communist Party, the point at issue is not only the fact that they are against proletarian dictatorship or the Soviet system, but that they are against the revolution generally. It is their opinion that in such a "democracy" as Switzerland the working class will gain its victory by Parliamentary means. They are not satisfied

with participation in Parliament alone; they are not even satisfied with the opportunist tactics of Parliament; they go much further than that; they accept local posts in the executive organs of the bourgeois Government and even accept the post of police directors, whose duty it is to suppress the revolutionary movement of the working class.

In Germany, the Independent German Social Democracy is generally in favour of proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet system. Under the pressure of the labouring masses which are tending more and more toward the last, even the leaders of the Right Wing of German Social Democracy who in the beginning of 1919 were still against the Soviet system are now obliged to accept this programme. If these leaders fail to carry out the definite decisions of their Congress to join the Communist International without delay in the event that negotiations with other parties would be prolonged, this is due solely to these leaders who consciously and intentionally sabotaged the decision of the Congress and set their own will against that of the German workers. These leaders repudiated the decision of their Congress by enquiring of the Communist International whether the latter was prepared to negotiate with them. The Executive Committee of the Communist International gave them a written reply. The leaders of the Independent Social Democracy

concealed this reply from the masses. They took no further steps to state their attitude towards the Communist International, and only recently we had to send them a letter reminding them of the expressed will of the great majority of their party.

Every conference in which they take part, as well as every congress which they arrange with other parties, has but one aim—to gain time; for as their political leader, Rudolph Hilferding, said: “ We must wait; we cannot trust to a ship which is liable to founder.” In the autumn of last year, at a moment of attack by Denikin and Yudenitch, the ship alluded to by Herr Hilferding was Soviet Russia—the mainstay of the Communist International. The leaders of the German Independent Social Democracy preferred to play a safe game, but Soviet Russia, however, did not perish, and the Communist International grew stronger. Just as Lloyd George and Churchill are delaying the peace negotiations begun with Russia, in the hope that the Polish White Guards would succeed where Denikin and Yudenitch failed—just so does Herr Hilferding prefer to wait a little—perhaps the member of the Second International, the marshal of the Polish White Guard troops, Pilsudsky, will save him and his like from the Third International. In France, the Longuetists are in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviets in Russia, but they

have no faith in their own revolution, doing nothing to hasten its course. They also confer and "wait" for the creation of a new International out of the Communist International, together with such "splendid" revolutionary elements as they themselves represent.

Finally the party, in whose name comrades Wallhead and Clifford Allen have addressed us, is made up of only one-fourth of consistent and sincere adherents to the Communist International. To another fraction of the party the question is not yet clear, while a third part, which probably consists of half the party, is headed by the most influential old leaders of the I.L.P., and represents a policy of opportunism and compromise with the bourgeoisie, a policy of sentimental pacifism, a policy of middle-class ideology. This element of the party is consciously hostile to Communist policy. The conference of this group, in order "to study the question," is a manoeuvre of the leaders, who wish to postpone the moment of their downfall. The Communist International knew very well that a union with the revolutionary proletariat, in so far as the latter unfortunately still follows these parties, can come about only through the development of the revolution, through the growth of class-consciousness and not through conferences and compromises with the leaders. The Communist International has no reason to fear these conferences provided they are given full

publicity and provided the questions of the Communist International are debated by the Press organs of the various parties, and provided these parties renounce secret diplomacy and the shameless concealment of the documents of the Third International. To demand from the Communist International that it send delegates who are objects of persecution all over the world, for the purpose of enlightening the worthy opportunists of Switzerland, is positive proof to us that these gentlemen are intentionally sabotaging the will of the workers.

Surely, since it was possible for the revolutionary workers, lacking material means, but anxious to become acquainted with the Communist International, to see Soviet Russia with their own eyes—if these have proved able to come from as far as Australia and America, to make their way through some ten fronts to us—the more so could the representatives of influential, strong political parties manage to obtain the necessary permissions of their Governments to come to Moscow, or to get across illegally without standing any risk of being shot. At all events their lives will be protected by their respective Governments, to whom they are so valuable. We invite representatives individually and in a body to come to Moscow, and here to obtain a practical perspective of our policy and of our principles. We guarantee them that every word of theirs

will be saved for the future by means of a verbatim shorthand report, and will be afforded full publicity, in order that the workers may learn the distinction between the policy of these opportunist leaders and the policy of the Communist International, and we are convinced that this visit will greatly assist the spread of Communist ideas.

To the Communists and the Independent Labour Party.

The Communist International is anxiously following the development of the class struggle in England. It welcomes with deep satisfaction every manifestation for the awakening of the revolutionary consciousness of the mass of the British workers, every manifestation of their revolutionary energy. Marx said at one time that the world revolution is only a storm in a teacup until the British working class arises to overthrow British capitalism—the strongest capitalism in the world. Now British capitalism is no longer the strongest; it has a number of competitors and it has to withstand the blows dealt it by its colonial slaves. It is probable that upon throwing off the chains of the capitalist Governments the revolutionary proletariat of Europe will meet the resistance of Anglo-Saxon capital in the persons of British and American capitalists, who will attempt to blockade it—it is then possible that the revolutionary proletariat of Europe will

arise in union with the peoples of the East and commence a revolutionary struggle, the scene of which will be the entire world, to deal the final blow to British and American capitalism.

The outcome of this struggle will finally depend on the British workers. The final honour of settling with their own oppressors belongs to them; it will depend on this most advanced section of the working class, which once before in English history has pointed out the way to the workers of the world in the glorious Chartist movement. The result of such a movement will be self-liberation from oppression and exploitation, and will also be the pioneer of the world revolution. It is equipped for this to the fullest possible extent; the British working class possesses powerful trade unions; it has over six millions of workers; it possesses an old standing habit of organised action; it has a considerably high level of education, and at the present time it is awakening to revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary energy.

To be the pioneers of world-revolution there is but one thing lacking—the British working class should emancipate itself from the trade union policies and traditions of its leaders, it should accept the programme of revolutionary activity, for which purpose it should organise a strong Communist Party to guide its struggle; this Communist Party would infuse

its spirit in the mass organisations, and would take upon itself the initiative of establishing new unified organisations and labour councils. But the revolutionary forces of England are split up—a part of them are in the B.S.P., part of them are in the S.L.P., in the South Wales organisation and Scotland, in the Left Wing of the I.L.P. and the Communist groups. The Executive Committee of the Communist International appeals to the Communists of England to form one party. This party, in one rock-bound programme of the Communist International, should in its revolutionary, though as yet not fully class-conscious development, play a leading part, pointing out to the masses not only the general slogans, but also a definite road leading to their emancipation. This party should co-ordinate the activities of the masses with those of the national movements of Ireland, India and Egypt in order that the revolutionary masses of the British colonies should free themselves with the aid of the British workers, and not against them or even in the face of their passive protests.


For on this will depend the attitude of the colonists to the British proletariat at the critical moment when the country will be in the process of revolution, especially considering the fact that the food supply of the country is largely dependent upon these colonies. Raising aloft the youthful banner of Commun-

ism, the British Communist Party should remember that this banner can be led to victory not through propaganda alone, but mainly by the active participation in its mass organisations, actually proving to the labouring masses that the Communists are able to lead them in the struggle better and more effectively than anybody else. In this struggle, which began with demands for slight improvements of conditions, the Communist Party widens and consolidates its forces in a struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. The powerful British capitalism is not opposed by an equally powerful Communist Party. Capitalism, therefore, is able to split into parts the British Labour movement, to postpone the crisis, to corrupt the Labour movement, thus making its development more painful, more dangerous to the working class. The emancipation of the British working class and of the working class of the whole world depends upon the Communist elements of England forming a single Communist Party. We therefore say to the British Communists who appeal to the International proletariat, to unite with the Communist International:

Communists of Britain, Unite!

**The Executive Committee of the
Third Communist International.**

Moscow.



4357-8



UNIVERSITY

CALIFORNIA

Angel

East

6

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 427 962 6



L 005 331 132 0

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD



1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
IM L30202



University Research Library

CALL	NUMBER	SER	VOL

