

FEBRUARY, 1941 : No. 53

THREEPENCE

LEFT

Pigott's Political Dynamite

INTRODUCED BY

Michael Foot



WHAT BRITAIN MUST DO TO SAVE EUROPE

Luis Araqustain

WE NEED NEW FORMS OF RADICALISM

Wenzel Jaksch

BRITAIN'S ROLE IN EUROPE'S REVOLUTION

Hans Rucker

TACTICS FOR THE SOCIALIST ADVANCE

Julien Gorkin

INDIA'S TERMS — NEHRU

*See the
only*

AIM

This journal has no policy narrower than the achievement of the classless society and the co-operative commonwealth. It offers itself as a forum for the public discussion of all those differences concerning methods and tactics which create divisions between and within the Parties of the Left. Members of the Labour Party, Co-operative Party, Independent Labour Party, and Communist Party, and socialists belonging to any or no Party, are invited to contribute to its columns.

CONTENTS

PIGOTT'S POLITICAL DYNAMITE	
INTRODUCTION BY MICHAEL FOOT	25
PIGOTT'S (1794) DEFINITIONS	27
TOPIC OF THE MONTH:	
INTRODUCTION TO THE DISCUSSION	32
BRITAIN CAN AND MUST DO IT; LUIS ARAQUISTAIN	33
WE NEED NEW FORMS OF RADICALISM; WENZEL JAKSCH	38
BRITAIN'S ROLE IN EUROPE'S REVOLUTION	
HANS ROCKER	40
TACTICS FOR THE SOCIALIST ADVANCE	
J. GORKIN	43
INDIA'S TERMS—NEHRU	48

Editorial: The Editor, Left Forum, 35, St. Bride Street, London, E.C.4.

Subscriptions: R. E. Fitzgerald, 21, Brookside, East Barnet, Herts. (Subscription—2/- six months, 4/- twelve months, post free.)

General Correspondence: 35, St. Bride Street, London, E.C.4.

Pigott's Political Dynamite

Introduced by

MICHAEL FOOT

●

*History repeats itself, first as tragedy, next as farce, said Karl Marx in his famous passage in the Eighteenth Brumaire on the falsity of historical analogies. *The warning is especially apposite to-day at a time when the search for parallels from the past is conducted more busily than ever before. We are told, for instance, that Britain stands alone against Hitler and will eventually free a Continent united under one despotism just as she did in the days of Napoleon. William Pitt's speeches have even been reissued in book form with a foreword written by the Prime Minister himself.*

There is a faint, farcical (we hope), resemblance in the parallel. Napoleon was the bastard child of the Revolution and his inheritance gave terrific impetus to his conquests.

William Pitt, who had already sold his vaguely liberal principles in domestic politics to become a sycophant of the King, now believed that he could withstand the torrential ideas pouring across Europe by a miserable patchwork of feudal armies, supported by British subsidies.

Pitt, whose squalid, mean, contorted mind reminds me instantly of Mr. Chamberlain, sought Britain's salvation in an alliance with the King Carols and Colonel Becks of the day. Because no political idea directed the conduct of the war from our side it had to be war by military means alone and by profit from Napoleon's errors. In the end after the prolonged agony "the kings crept out again to feel the sun." Pitt's successors set their hands to the task of restoring the old world of 1789 in all its immaculate dullness and misery.

Britain might win this war against Nazism by military means alone and through Hitler's blunders. It would be a long, hazardous, bloody business. However we have the chance to do something different. Hitler's black despotism contains none of the truly revolutionary purpose which inspired Napoleon's armies in the early years. Our own rulers, whatever charges may be made against them, are forced by circumstances to take account of new ideas which never had the faintest opportunity of admittance to the councils of William Pitt. Pitt fought to make the world safe for feudalism; he hated the Revolution as much as Napoleon. He was never the leader of a united people as myth has portrayed him. He was a relentless reactionary at home as abroad.

Here are extracts from a brilliant piece of Left-Wing invective published in the early days of the war against France. The picture which the author gives of the British rulers who conducted that war make even the most objectionable of our present rulers appear paragons of enlightenment. If any among the latter believe that William Pitt should be their model, the business of the Left must surely be to teach them differently. If you object to the idea of becoming a serf under the Nazis and if you believe in the folly of conducting a war for liberation on the Pitt method, the only middle course must surely be to seek to give the war a political direction which offers something better than a victorious Waterloo some ten years hence. This is the immediate duty of Socialists. A touch of the pamphleteering skill displayed in this book might help us in the task.

* * * *

According to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Charles Pigott, who died in 1794, was an ardent champion of the French Revolution; published in 1791 a reply to Burke. He issued anonymously in 1792 a *History of the Jockey Club* and in 1794 a *History of the Female Jockey Club*, two scurrilous pamphlets on London society, with which he seems to have been well acquainted. He has also written *Treachery No Crime* and other works. He died at Westminster on June 24th, 1794, leaving a satire entitled *A Political Dictionary*, which was published in 1795 and is now reprinted by *Left Forum*.

Pigott's (1794) Definitions

Absurdity:

Mr. Pitt's surplus fund, his Majesty's civil-list, and the combination of kings, to restore priesthood, aristocracy, and monarchy in France.

Abuse:

The different governments of Europe: privileged orders; church establishments.

Adam:

The only man of his time, a true *Sans Culottes*, and the first revolutionist.

Advantage:

The evacuation of Toulon; the retreat from Dunkirk; the French triumphant masters of the sea; and Earl Moira's expedition to the coast of Brittany.

America:

A bright and immortal example to all colonies groaning under a foreign yoke, proving the invincible energy and virtue of Freedom, and enjoying a state of prosperity, since she has thrown off her dependence on Great Britain, hitherto unknown in the nations of Europe.

Ambassador:

A privileged spy; a genuine representative of royalty.

Argument:

Proclamation, manifestos, Newgate, fine, pillory, *Botany Bay*.

Aristocrat:

A fool, or scoundrel, generally both; a monster of rapacity, and an enemy of mankind.

Army (standing):

An engine employed in monarchies by which nations are enslaved. Dalrymple observes that "slavery follows a standing army as sure as the shadow follows the body."

Bishop:

A wolf in sheep's clothing.

Brunswick:

(Duke of) the victorious hero who threatened to exterminate twenty-five millions of people if they did not submit to his arbitrary conditions; and who, in less than a fortnight afterwards, was completely routed and put to flight by a few volunteers of the above people.

Cannon:

The only argument of conviction to despots.

Charity:

Enormous contributions for French rebels; an utter neglect of our own poor.

Chastity (vertu unique):

Queen Charlotte.

Church:

A patent for hypocrisy; the refuge of sloth, ignorance and superstition, the corner-stone of tyranny.

Citizen:

The most honourable of titles; the definition of a virtuous man.

Coalition:

An union of parties, when monopoly on either side is impossible and when the principle itself is threatened, to defend and divide the loaves and fishes.

Company (East India):

Chartered robbers, licensed murderers, sending out military ruffians to conquer, plunder, and desolate the remotest countries.

Confidence:

A word employed by statesmen in order to preserve their power and enslave a nation to their yoke.

Contractors:

A set of men who are known to live in luxury on the plunder of the ignorant, the innocent, and the helpless: upon that part of the community which stands most in need of and best deserves the care and protection of the legislature.

In all Ministerial *contracts* it is never a question of making a profitable bargain for the public; the only object is to enrich the CONTRACTOR, who is always a *creature of the Minister*. Brook Watson, etc., etc.

Contrast:

The invincible ardour, the independent spirit of a FRENCH REPUBLICAN; the tame servility, the fawning sycophancy of *British courtier*; the RIGHTS OF MAN, by THOMAS PAINE; the *libel on the human race* by the *Right Honourable Edmund Burke*; the manifestos of tyrants, the answers of freemen, the *impudent assertions of Grenville or Mansfield*; the IRRESISTIBLE TRUTHS of STANHOPE; a convention of the people, a parliament of aristocracy.

Corporation:

An infamous relic of the ancient feudal system; a tyrannical, exclusive monopoly, generally consisting of gluttons, idiots, and oppressors; brutes in a human form.

Corruption:

"The oil which makes the wheels of Government go well."

Courtier:

Duke of Montrose, Lords Chesterfield, Elgin, Sydney, Rivers, Onslow, etc., etc., a sycophant.

Court:

The dunghill that breeds the above vermin; the focus that consumes the industry and labour of the people. Halifax, himself a courtier, styles it a den of well-fed, well-dressed beggars.

Crown:

A jewel that dazzles the eye of the vulgar by its extrinsic splendour; the gewgaw and pageantry which it displays reconciles the nation to a bauble which costs a million annually to support, drained from the virtue of industry and the sweat of labour. Partial splendour, public calamity.

Delusion:

The ruling principle and last

surviving hope of the British Cabinet.

Democrat:

One who maintains the rights of the people; an enemy to privileged orders and all monarchical encroachments, the advocate of peace, economy, and reform. Aristotle affirms that liberty can never flourish out of a democracy. Montesquieu calls it the nursery of virtue.

Discontent (popular):

In the aristocratic dictionary, sedition. When people, vexed and goaded by oppression, express discontent, aristocracy deems it sedition. The judges tell them they have *no right* to complain; things cannot be better, and the *law* finally condemns them to the pillory, fine, and two years' confinement in one of his Majesty's *Bastilles*, there to learn patience, resignation, and submission. The word will also admit of another construction. "When popular discontents have been very prevalent, it may safely be affirmed that there has been something amiss in the *constitution* or in the conduct of Government." Burke's Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents. Mr. Burke's opinion has since undergone a complete revolution.

Disappointment:

Our *Royal Dunkirk Hero* raising the siege of that place, reduced to the necessity of leaving his artillery behind, and of saving himself by a precipitated flight; the evacuation of Toulon, and the recovery of King George III. in the year 1789.

Divinity:

The Bench of Bishops uniformly voting in their capacity as legislators against the maxims of the gospel, in support of war and extermination.

Emigrant (English):

One who, like Dr. Priestly or Thomas Cooper, is compelled to fly from persecution and explore

liberty in a far distant land, probably America, the States of Europe, for the most part, France excepted, being rank despotisms. The late dreadful punishments that have been inflicted under the sanction of a Government *calling itself free*; the restrictions imposed upon citizens; the intolerable and still increasing taxes, the foreign armies that have been landed, and the military barracks erected throughout the country have produced an extraordinary effect on the public mind, and threaten such an emigration as ought to create the most serious apprehensions. When Mr. Pitt was called into power, the death warrant of Old England's remaining liberties, and, with them, of her greatness, was signed. It were preposterous to suppose, whenever peace shall be established, that industry and labour will devote their services to an old, exhausted, worn-out system, working its own dissolution, and which is only preserved in its present rotten state by an immensity of impost that robs the virtues by which alone it is kept from mortification; while new constitutions, UNTAXED, with every advantage of climate and all the irresistible charms of Freedom shall invite them to emigration. England, thy sun is set.

Emigrant (French):

One who flies his country struggling for freedom, and becomes its enemy; who enlists under a foreign banner to fight against it. One who labours by treason and massacre to revive that ancient despotism under which so many millions of victims were born *without hope* and perished *through want*, but under which he himself enjoyed all the *milk and honey* of the land.

Enemy (natural):

National enmities have been always produced and encouraged by kingly and priestly policy. The wolf is the *natural enemy* of the lamb; the vulture of the dove. By

instinct they are so. They must live; but one people can never be the *natural enemy* of another; unless we consider mankind in the same savage light as the vulture and the wolf. A nation is no more than a member of that large family, the human race, and can only flourish in proportion with the felicity and welfare of the whole. What greater absurdity can be imagined than that a people who owe all their prosperity to commerce, that is to say, to their connections with other people, should call themselves the *natural enemy* of this or that people, and, indeed, of everything that is not confined within their own circle! Is it not evident that this abominable prejudice is kept up by a gang of *plunderers* and *monopolisers*, under protection of CHURCH and STATE, who find their advantage and emolument in it?

Enquiry:

According to the modern construction, signifies sedition. In the old English dictionary it was held a CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGE, derived from MAGNA CHARTA and the BILL OF RIGHTS, for the people to *enquire* into the conduct of kings or ministers, and into the errors of their government; but all things now seem in a state of revolution, and, according to Mr. Pitt's new code, which is implicitly adopted by all the legal courts through the three kingdoms, *enquiry* implies disloyalty, sedition, or treason, and they who are *audacious* enough to claim this ancient *obsolete* privilege expose themselves to the penalties of fine, pillory, or imprisonment, and if in Scotland, of transportation for fourteen years to BOTANY BAY. The people, however, begin to murmur at the revolution that the word has undergone and to *think* this is not altogether a FREE COUNTRY.

Enterprise:

In the alarmist vocabulary, signi-

fies everything morally and physically impossible; equal wisdom, equal strength, equal wealth, etc., etc., but equality *truly* signifies, both in France and England, as well as everywhere else, "EQUAL RIGHTS," a RIGHT of every citizen, not disqualified by nature or by crime, to the protection and benefits of society; a right of voting for the election of those who are to make laws by which his liberty, his property, and his life are affected, and an equal right of exerting to advantage the genius and talents which he may possess—the equal rights of nature.

Famine:

For the existence of this word we are indebted to the *magnanimous* exploits of CONQUERORS and KINGS. It is generally applied in an extensive sense, signifying whole nations or provinces reduced to a want of the necessary articles of life; a general scarcity. Indulgent nature had liberally provided, throughout the world, everything requisite for the sustenance and use of its inhabitants; and it is only by an ungrateful abuse of her liberality, by a departure from her mild and equal system, that man is become his own tormentor.

Fashion:

Whatever custom prevails amongst the great, whatever mode of dress, particular idiom of expression, or *cant* word, is by them employed, we style *Fashion*; and, in general, no matter how contemptible, mischievous, or unnatural, we are eager to adopt and practise the absurdity.

Fool:

It was once the fashion in European courts to keep a fool for the diversion of *Kings*. A fool is not at present specifically mentioned in our civil list, although we all know that it is clogged with many fools, for whose follies and prodigalities John Bull is foolish enough to pay most extravagantly, while he himself is hardly indulged with a

morsel of bread to allay his hunger. The old custom of retaining a *fool* and *jester* is not altogether obsolete at the British court. Quick, the low comedian, and the Earl of C—st—ld are two distinguished favourites and companions of our *wise* Monarch G—ge III.

Garter (Order of the):

The pride of modern nation converts even the plaything of an infant into an object of glory and emulation. The English triumphantly boast that *their Kings* never wore any *foreign* order, while many foreign kings and eight emperors have been decorated with the GARTER. Virtuous exultation! But the *free* nations of antiquity were not *vain* of the *vanity* of others. The Greek and Roman commonwealths fixed their affections on different objects. We have in England *right honourable* and *noble Garters* of various colours; but the *blue*, which, by way of preference we call THE GARTER, is reckoned the prettiest; and *my Lord* will at any time give up the *green* or the *red* to get at the *blue*, which makes him the *happiest* of men, and is considered by this GREAT NATION as the *ultimatum* of greatness: if, therefore, he be not speedily presented with a ribband for his neck, of a *coarser grain*, we may expect to see our *heaven-born* Minister invested with THE GARTER. *In either case he will be exalted.*

Gracious:

Proud, insolent, false, and contemptible.

Greatness:

In its primitive sense, liberty, valour, honour, virtue, and benevolence; at present, drunkenness, tyranny, extortion, treachery, and arrogance.

Guess:

How Pitt will be able to get through the present war.

Gun:

An engine of destruction; so heavy that a man in England can't

carry it for less than a hundred a year.

To guzzle:

A ministerial and aldermanic recreation.

Hell:

A place of torment; where there is neither liberty of speech nor liberty of thought, nor liberty of action; where men can be imprisoned at the will of a minister, without ever being brought to trial; where the rich exult and riot at the expense of the poor; where vice triumphs, profligacy prevails, and war, taxes, and desolation are *consolations* of the people.

Hemp:

A plant with which they make *ropes*. Never did the cultivation of *hemp* deserve more encouragement than in the year of our Lord 1794, when the horrible crimes of aristocracy seem to be preparing punishments that will require a vast consumption of the above *salutary* vegetable. The *guillotine* is not yet introduced into England.

Historiographer:

Historian paid to conceal THE TRUTH. It seems the ancient despots had neglected this precaution, to save their memory from the judgment of posterity. It is not requisite to unite the qualities of TACITUS to be a modern historiographer, but those of Dr. Johnson, Arthur Young, etc., etc.

To illuminate:

To darken the human understanding by every possible artifice. Thus the ministerial newspapers of the present time may be said to illuminate the public.

Immediately:

In ministerial language, signifies some years hence, or perhaps never.

Imminent:

The dangers which threaten aristocracy.

Immoderate:

The national debt, taxes, tithes, and aristocratic insolence.

Impertinent:

To pass a lord without bowing,

or to look at ministers with a smile.

Impossibility:

For an Englishman to get promotion on the mere score of merit, without interest.

Importance:

A few yards of ribband strung across the shoulders.

Impress:

To take a man by force from his own home and the bosom of his family, and compel him to fight for his King and Country.

Imprisonment:

Ministerial argument, or an answer to all complaints.

Justice:

Obsolete.

Knight:

A strange sort of an animal into which the King sometimes transforms a man; thus, Sir Watkin Lews, Sir James Saunderson, Sir Jeffery Dunstand, and Sir Sidney Smith are knights.

Knowing:

Is applied to being acquainted with every species of aristocratic foppery and vice.

Labour:

The occupation of the Swinish Multitude, who are kept to it twelve hours a day, though it can hardly procure subsistence for wife and family, as considering the present enormous taxes, six or seven shillings a week is scarce sufficient to provide bread for one.

To Lavish:

To spend money like a prince at the national expense.

Law:

A very expensive commodity, rather more advantageous to the rich and prosperous than to the poor and wretched.

Loyalty (true):

Extends to one country as well as to the prince; and to oppose tyranny is no breach of *loyalty*, but an essential branch of it.

Luxury:

Profusion, debauchery; Carlton-House.

The Discussion on "Can Britain Organise Europe?"

In the December, 1940, issue of LEFT we published an article by "Continental" *Can Britain Organise Europe?* This has evoked widespread discussion and has been generally acclaimed a most important contribution. We briefly reiterate "Continental's" argument.

1. As Britain is vitally interested in the future of Europe, if only for reasons of security, an alternative to Hitler's New Order is clearly necessary. But Britain cannot plan and organise a European Federation alone, nor can she build up a system of alliances which would oblige her to police the Continent permanently.

2. Britain's participation in a European system of collective security could be as energy saving if (1) it did not involve a one-sided economic orientation and if (2) it was built not just on pious federal ideas, but on the previous liquidation of the major factors of Continental national strife.

3. These conditions of a workable federation can only be fulfilled as a result of a series of national and social revolutions of different types, according to the stage of development and the actual situation of the different European countries. The revolutionary forces are there and will explode once the machine of oppression cracks.

4. But if this revolutionary Europe emerges, the influence of Britain will be enormous, not only as the strongest single factor in its security system, but also as the indispensable mediator to the outside world. For Europe was never a self-sufficient economic unit, and after the devastation of war it will be dependent, throughout the years of reconstruction, on one-sided supplies from overseas, *id est* primarily from the English-speaking world. Whether a revolutionary Continent of Socialist and semi-Socialist countries will get this indispensable aid from a still capitalist world will largely depend on the attitude and the strength of the British Labour Movement.

We publish now a number of discussion articles representing views of both Continental and British Socialists and we hope to bring a further two important articles in the March issue of LEFT.

This month we print three representative views of Continental Socialists. Next month we shall have British Socialists presenting their views and later those of the Colonial and American Left.

CONTRIBUTOR No. 1 is **LUIS ARAQUISTAIN**, a leading Spanish Socialist and Ambassador of the Republic to FRANCE ————— He says

Britain Can and Must Do It

The future of Europe will be not only what the British think and want it to be, but also what other Europeans may wish, and if the Europeans of the Continent fail in their vision, all the good faith and intellectual keenness that the British may apply to the problem will be doomed to hopeless frustration.

HITLER'S ARGUMENT

"Continental" claims repeatedly the need for all of us to be realists. But he forgets some important realities. He forgets what the economic interests of Britain in Europe have been. He says, "While the Empire and its communications are intact, no economic order in Europe is likely to do decisive damage to British economy." He forgets that Hitler has been using continuously this same argument—that Britain has no economic interests on the Continent, that she has enough markets in her Empire.

To show that this argument is not true, I shall quote a few figures:

In 1937—the last year of an economic normality in Europe—the imports of Great Britain amounted to £1,027,824,000 and the exports to £531,391,000 (to which should be added £75,134,000 as re-exports). In those amounts the proportion of the trade between the British countries was 39.43 per cent. for the imports and 48.32 per cent. for the exports. The proportion of the trade with the foreign countries was 60.57 per cent. for the imports and 51.68 per cent. for the exports, and that of the trade with European countries alone was 30.43 per cent. for the imports and 30.12 per cent. for the exports. (See *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1939.)

This means that the trade of Britain with Europe was nearly a third of her total trade. To this we must add the British capital invested in Europe: a huge sum of many hundred million pounds.

It cannot therefore be said that the economic interests of Britain in Europe are far from being vital. The total loss of the European markets, as Hitler intends, would entail the ruin of a great part of British economy. The consequence would be disastrous also to the economies of all the American countries: Britain is their best market, and also because of the trading restrictions which Germany would impose on the whole European Continent should she emerge victorious from the war. The economic decadence of Britain and America would drive them to Fascism, as it has driven Germany and Italy, and as it drove the Hellenistic world to the tyrannies of the fourth and third centuries before our era. *Therefore one of the main aims of the war, perhaps the main one, is to preserve and strengthen the present economic standard of the nations designed as democracies. Only in this way can their political régimes be saved and later developed to higher degrees of perfection.*

SOCIALISTS LIKE CAESAR

Some Socialists, who, like Caesar, want everything or nothing, are indifferent to the fate of the capitalist democracies. But history inexorably confronts us with her own problems, without paying much attention to the solutions which we nicely pull out of our wishful thinking heads, and the European and world dilemma to-day, whether we like it or not, is not Capitalism or Socialism, but relatively democratic capitalism or absolutely despotic capitalism. This is the dilemma that is being imposed on us by the war and we have to choose between the two terms—the indifference of the doctrinaire helps only the absolutism.

To deny or to ignore these realities is to forget, too, the economic background of this war. That background shows that the political structure of Europe did no longer correspond to its economic necessity. This necessity demands the unification of the European economic system. *Britain needs that unification as much as any European country.* It is a gross mistake to believe that she has enough with the markets of her Empire, of America and Asia. She badly needs Europe.

Fascism, too, cannot rely on colonies—their development is slow and their profit problematic—and it seeks therefore the extension of the home market. Its ideal in the case of Europe is to create one market of the entire Continent; to transform the economic systems of all its countries; to suppress by force or by competition all artificial and parasitic industries and to intensify the production of such materials and goods as are most suitable to the natural wealth of each land.

This economic unification of Europe is neither bad nor good by itself. It will be either good or bad according to its means and its ends. The means of the totalitarian States are before our eyes—to restore a servile economic system like that of the old Asiatic and Incaic empires, destroying the independence of the people and the liberties of men. The ends are not yet visible, but already through the fog of Nazi pseudo-ideologies, we see a glimmer of what they would be—a *Herrenvolk* or a nation of masters which by a pretended right of a pretended racial superiority and by the force of arms is trying to impose its despotism first on this Continent and later on the others.

FEDERAL SUCCESS RARE IN HISTORY

That would be the fate and the "new order" of Europe after a German victory. But if Germany is defeated, then we have these alternatives—either, as "Continental" suggests, Britain would leave to Europe the task of administering the British victory as its people would like, without any other British intervention than that of protecting with her Fleet the new revolutionary order of Europe against any possible interference from overseas;—or that the new Europe should be organised under the leadership of Britain according to similar principles which regulate the British Commonwealth of Nations in order to harmonise what only on very rare occasions in history has been successfully realised: the freedom of various States and their citizens, and their permanent union in a federal organisation. (Edward Freeman only recognised four great historical examples of federal government—the Achaean League, the Swiss Cantons, the United Provinces of the Netherlands, and the United States of America. See his *History of Federal Government*, more actual now than when it was first published in 1863.)

The first solution has its dangers. Because there is a third probability. Once Germany is defeated and Britain is standing aloof from the European wasp's nest, does "Continental" believe that the peoples of Europe will have nothing else to do but joyously to promote the badly-needed national revolutions and tardily to prepare the economic unity of the Continent? If he expects only that, I am afraid his surprise will be great and not very pleasant.

Let us have no doubts about this—over a Germany dislocated by defeat and over an Europe shaken by revolution a third uncalled-for umpire would silently advance like a thief in the night to take his spoils of an unfought war. I mean the Soviet mammoth, who now reserves and accumulates his more or less neutral forces just for that critical moment. Russia would step over the Central Europe and the Balkans. She too cherishes

the wishful dream to dominate and exploit the Continent, wiping out nationalities and individual liberties, not, like the Nazi Germany, in name of a racial myth, but in name of a pseudo-Socialist fable and for the exclusive benefit of a party. And who could again save Europe from that new invasion but Britain?

This interests, I think, Britain as much as the Continent. She needs the markets of a Europe economically unified and politically free as much as a Europe under the yoke of the Nazi arms needs the British forces. If you leave out this economic reality—interwoven, of course, with the political reality—all our theories and hopes will fall into a phantasmagoric utopia. Europe needs the armed forces of Britain in peace as much as now in war. Nobody is justified to fear her power—it is enough to see how she uses it in her Dominions.

PLATONIC REVOLUTION

I do not believe, like "Continental," that Britain has to organise European revolutions only to win the war and platonically tolerate them later. These revolutions, too, will compel Britain's interest. The reason for this is that the greatest obstacle to a Europe politically free and economically unified will certainly come from those bourgeoisies who in the past took advantage of the national movements to found, in their own interest and often against the interest of their peoples, artificial economic systems that had no rational basis and brought about the anarchic atomisation of the Continental production and finally two great wars. The main aim of the next European revolutions will be to sweep away this national particularism in order to adjust the economic unity of Europe.

This is the interest of all the European peoples, as only in this way can they become masters of their political régimes. On the other hand, it is the interest of Britain and America not only to tolerate but to promote a Socialist Europe, or at least, to begin with, a Socialist Germany and perhaps a half Socialist France and Italy. This would wind up old historical rivalries, and would remove for ever from power the traditional oligarchic classes bred for hatred and aggression. It would lift to power the classes most interested in a free and economically unified Continent, and improve their social conditions. This will eliminate the economic basis of Fascism all over the world.

INCORRUPTIBLE HISTORY

Yes, let us be realists, i.e., let us not fear to look at the bottom of the incorruptible historical facts, and let us neither fear to call things by their names. The first aim is to save democracies, in spite of all their limitations and deficiencies, because the only inescapable alternative to that is a most brutal despotism, to

which everything is preferable, even death. And not only democracies must be saved, but politically and economically invigorated. as only in that way will they survive. If the democracies on both sides of the Atlantic are saved and strengthened, then Fascism will be avoided even after its defeat—*because the dangers of its resurrection will not so soon disappear.*

This is the mission of Britain, of her thinkers, of her statesmen, of her captains of industry, of her workers, of her sailors, of her soldiers, of the whole nation. (Her social and political future is not my business, it is the business of her own people. As a European, I dare only to speak of the desirable Britain's relations with Europe.) And don't let us be frightened by the right word—the Greeks used to call it hegemony, which does not mean domination, but guide or presidency. Not the hegemony of Macedonia, which was the Prussia of Greece, as Germany is to-day the Macedonia of Europe, and some German historians, as Droysen, admit the parallel and are proud of it. That hegemony was an Asiatic despotism, as the Nazi one. We may think of a hegemony like that of Athens at a time and like what could have been, and ought to have been, that of Rome at the beginning of the second century before our era.

THE ROME OF TO-DAY

Let us hope that the Rome of to-day—which is no longer in the Mediterranean but in the Atlantic—will be more enlightened and intelligent than the ancient one, although she sometimes suffers from the same hesitations, the same ignorance and the same apathy in regard to the European world as the old one suffered in regard to the Greeks. But the Europeans themselves ought not to foster these insular shortcomings, especially when the hour strikes for the peace for which Britain and all her friends are striving. The good *hegemon*, the guide voluntarily accepted, needs the political and intellectual co-operation of his future confederates. Amongst free men and peoples the hegemony dissolves itself at the end in a mere democratic function. Only so, will Europe be able to emerge from the chaos in which she writhes to-day, and only then this war will have been something more than another immense bath of blood.

DO YOU KNOW THAT

Rats ! An exposure of Finance and Financiers, is the next choice of the Left Book Club.

You can get full particulars of this and forthcoming books from

THE SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP,
35 ST. BRIDE STREET, LONDON, E.C.4
IT'S ANOTHER TORY M.P.

CONTRIBUTOR No. 2 is **WENZEL JAKSCH**
London Representative of the SUDETEN-GERMAN
SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS— He says

We Need New Forms of Radicalism

Dear Comrade,

I think the article "Can Britain Organise Europe?" in the January "Left" a very valuable contribution to the Socialist discussion on issues of war and peace. In commenting on it I merely wish to emphasise my approval of the author's thorough realism. It is our duty as Socialists to develop a new form of radicalism, the radicalism not of revolutionary doctrinarism, but of full realisation of the European realities with which we shall be faced after the overthrow of the great dictatorships. We shall have to bear in mind the fact that the European counter-revolution originated in two countries which had embarked upon radical experiments that were in flagrant contradiction with the historical, geographical, and economic realities, from Hungary and Bavaria. We, the Socialists, shall not only have to achieve a revolution, but to prevent the victory of a new wave of counter-revolution. Though bleeding from a thousand wounds, demoralised and economically disorganised, Europe, after severe trials, will find a way out of her present state and will again have to steer the course of progressive evolution.

I do not, therefore, believe in that paper radicalism which proclaims a "Socialist Europe" as the immediate post-war aim without giving much thought to the realities of power politics in Europe and the world. Our immediate task is that of liberation. First of all, the military power of Great Britain, allied with the anti-totalitarian forces on the Continent, must break Hitler's and Mussolini's totalitarian machineries. The more efficient the co-operation of these two factors, the surer and sooner will the aim be achieved. In the European revolution that will ensue we shall in the first instance have to fight to secure the victory of the constructive forces.

As a constructive force of the first importance I consider a free and independent Labour Movement renewed throughout the Continent. But the workers alone cannot reorganise Europe.

They need contacts with all moral forces that are still intact, as *i.e.*, with those religious forces that are not discredited by their conduct in the period of totalitarianism. They must come to terms with the masses of the peasants provided they are willing to make a contribution to the organisation of peace and social security. Nor should those elements of the middle classes and the intelligentsia who have been definitively cured of their sympathies for the "Führer" principle, be excluded, if the forces of counter-revolution (the military caste, the big landowners, the financial and industrial magnates) are to be cut off from any potential mass basis.

Labour will thus have a larger or smaller share in the exercise of power in the different countries, according to the social structure of the respective country. If the Labour Movement is to steer clear of short-term dictatorial experiments that would only pave the way for a counter-revolution, it will have to pursue a policy of alliances both bold and elastic. We must strive for the establishment of a co-operative order after this war, an order based on the solid foundation of a democratic federal system and offering the best possible chances for the evolution towards Socialism.

By these few remarks I wished to point out that the main conclusions of the article, "Can Britain Organise Europe?" seem to me to be perfectly in line with the principles of Socialist post-war strategy. Although I foresee a great future for the British Labour Movement, I would prefer, on the day of armistice, not to see it faced with the dilemma: Socialist revolution or nationalist-militarist counter-revolution on the Continent. A Great Britain which the antagonism with regard to the post-war reconstruction of Europe would have divided into two strong hostile camps would only further the chances of the third possibility: chaos. And chaos would give birth to new dictatorships.

What we expect from Great Britain after this war, both in her and in our interest, is support of all constructive forces on the Continent. She is sure to be backed in this enterprise by U.S.A. and by the Dominions. Once the danger of chaos is overcome and the foundations are laid for a federal peace settlement, we shall all—each in his country, yet by the closest possible international co-operation—strive and struggle for a maximum of socialist fulfilment in our time. My confidence in the future of democratic Socialism is so great that I do not think it necessary to proclaim it as a particular war aim. It will grow from the desire of the freed nations for peace and social security. What we are called upon to achieve is a national as well as international system of democracy apt to further the welfare of peoples and the social and cultural rise of the masses.

London, January 11th, 1941.

WENZEL JAKSCH.

CONTRIBUTOR No. 3 is **HANS ROCKER**

A great authority on Central Europe—*He discusses*

Britain's Role in the European Revolution

★ THE European Revolution will emerge from a series of revolutions; revolutions which at first will be as different from each other as the countries in which they will happen. But these differences are only one side of the picture. The other, very important side will be the tendency of all these revolutionary developments to seek a common level. Already to-day a number of common factors are visible and it seems to me important to emphasise these more fully than "Continental" has done in the December, 1940, issue of *LEFT*.

The revolutionary movements in all Continental lands will have to battle against one and the same fascist power. To this extent the various revolutions in Europe will have the same goal: to overthrow fascist domination in Europe. The purpose of these revolutions will be identical: freedom, national and political, safeguarding peace, and economic and social security.

The small European peoples have now learnt from bitter experience that they cannot by their own strength alone maintain either peace or freedom. Particularly in central Europe where large populations live in economic backwardness within the narrow artificial boundaries which are made worse by the urge of technical advance. This has led to mutual betrayal; to the destruction of these States one after another by the expanding German Fascist Imperialism.

So we lived to see the end of the period of 1918 to 1938 which began with the proclamation of national self-determination and ended with its destruction among the peoples of Europe. Now they have learnt that there is no safety in any land bordered by a fascist State. They have learnt that any national democratic revolution in any one part of Europe will be choked at birth by its reactionary neighbour who will not hesitate to organise and back the counter-revolution. And from this the people of Europe will learn that even the national freedom will be won only if they make common cause with their neighbouring common folk. In this way the destruction of the national States in Europe together with their oppression by German Fascist Imperialism becomes the first conscious premise for the truly European revolution.

The rule of Fascism, it is true, produces also counter-tendencies. The ruling power is German; Fascism is forced upon Europe by the German armies. The oppressed peoples battling against the dominating Fascism will battle against the German Fascism. In this way the struggle for freedom in Europe will appear as a struggle for liberation from the German yoke. The German Fascist rule thus leads to the crescendo of hate of Germany and a revival of extreme nationalism in Europe.

The "Democratic Imperialists" may be tempted to limit the coming revolutions in Europe (which must follow or accompany a defeat of Hitler) to a purely national liberation with the aid of conservative and reactionary allies in the countries concerned. Something on the lines of the States created at Versailles might be re-imposed. This process may be aided by the hatreds let loose by the Nazis. With the restoration of anything similar to the old State system in Europe it would again become impossible to solve the problems of Europe peacefully. It simply cannot be restored.

But it is altogether wrong to leave out of our reckoning the decisive role which the working classes will play in the anti-Fascist revolutions in Central and Western Europe. They will be least affected by purely national consideration. They will have least forgotten how the patriotic and nationalist upper classes on the Continent had sold their countries or forced them to capitulate before Hitler. These workers know how to value the democratic and freedom-loving asseverations of their bourgeoisie.

These memories will become active political factors once Fascist rule begins to wobble. These workers will assuredly seek to safeguard their national and democratic rights in such a manner that no monopolist or Junker beaureaucratic or military clique will be in a position to destroy them through counter-revolutionary *coups* or through political and military treachery.

NON-INTERVENTION IS NOT ENOUGH

In this battle to safeguard their achievements revolutionary democracy will seek the aid of its neighbours. This revolutionary process will show more clearly than anything else to the peoples of Europe that their fate is inextricably bound to each other, geographically, economically and technically, and that theirs is a common European aim. The common level will co-ordinate the varying stages of national revolution. The national revolution against the domination of Fascist Imperialism will have to become the European revolution if it is to triumph, or if it fails to do this, it will again be defeated as it was at the end of the last war.

It is true—as "Continental" says—that it is not the role of Britain to organise the European revolution and to give unto itself the post of leader. But is it enough if Britain only assures the European revolution of unspecified help and non-intervention? In the future this may mean a lot—but at present it is not enough.

At present certain influential circles in Britain are strongly backing Conservative and reactionary emigres who played a considerable role in helping the Nazis into power and who count now for nothing in their own countries. These right wing circles have been encouraged in their effort to regain their old positions in their countries and to replace the Hitler dictatorship by a somewhat milder and more gentlemanly dictatorship.

It cannot be gainsaid that all promises that there shall be no counter-revolutionary intervention in Europe will be suspect so long as these reactionary circles are encouraged and supported, because they can only be brought back to power in their land with the aid of a counter-revolutionary army of intervention. So long as preference is given also to paid agents instead of straightforward political alliances with the real forces in the democratic reformation of Europe, any concentration of the German opposition and co-operation among the various national emigrations will remain a serious difficulty. And so long as this happens certain Left Wing circles and some Socialists in emigration will think it inopportune to demand and propagate the European revolution because it is neither desired nor popular in the ruling circles of democratic Britain.

British Imperialism is achieving amazing results in order to bring German Fascism to fall, but British Democracy could do much more to shorten the war and to win the peace if it would fully support the forces of European revolution and encourage the creation of a unified and Democratic Europe. British Democracy and particularly the Labour Movement will have to deal realistically with the suppressed—but existing—forces of the European revolution. Their democratic representatives in exile must be fully co-opted and must be considered as equal partners and allies of Britain.

A courageous and progressive foreign policy *vis-a-vis* the oppressed peoples of Europe will be the "realist" policy to-day because it alone can turn the purely military defeat of Fascism into the great constructive change, the European revolution, which now becomes the main item on the agenda of the history of our times.

The Price We Pay!

4/- a year for a subscription to
LEFT FORUM

Have You Paid?

● JULIEN GORKIN

Tactics for the Socialist Advance

The following is summarised by Fenner Brockway from a statement sent by Julien Gorkin, Political Secretary of the P.O.U.M. and Secretary of the International Revolutionary Marxist Centre, to the Independent Labour League of America, in reply to views expressed by Jay Lovestone, its secretary. These were printed in LEFT in November, 1940.

★ ★ ★

In March, 1940, with the war already in full swing, the Parties of our Centre resident in France approved a long thesis which affirmed:

1. The war is not between Democracy and Fascism but between two rival imperialist factions.
2. Stalin, through his pact with Hitler, helped to release the forces of war. Stalin is interested in provoking the ruin of the imperialist countries, with the object of consolidating and enlarging Russia's territorial and strategical positions, not by revolutionary action and self-determination, but by armed conquest.
3. International Social Democracy contributed to the preparation of the war and is destined at its end to play a counter-revolutionary role, as it did in 1918-19.
4. Countries cannot be neutral. The small nations will not be able to maintain their independence by allying themselves with one imperialist group. Japan will attempt to take advantage of the war to realise imperialist domination of the Pacific. U.S.A. will attempt to complete the task unfinished in the last war: (a) the economic and political unification of the American hemisphere, (b) the development of an immense fleet with strategic bases to ensure domination of the seas, (c) the economic penetration of the colonies, and (d) the financial colonisation of the future Europe.
5. The question of "war or peace" should be considered by the proletariat from the class view—against imperialist war and for the only effective peace, socialist peace. It should strive to turn the war into a proletarian revolution.
6. The independent revolutionary parties have the duty of saving the socialist banner and working-class honour.

At the time this declaration was made, all Parties affiliated to the Centre stood for this position. During recent months the I.L.L. of America has changed its policy from this position as a result of the development of the war. What changes have taken place?

After invading Czechoslovakia, Hitler has occupied Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and a large part of France. Under the direction of the Vichy Government, the politics of even unoccupied France have remained largely subject to the dictates of Hitler and Mussolini. Since Franco's victory, Spain does not enjoy real liberty from the Axis Powers. Swedish independence is more formal than real; it is subject to the will of Hitler, to whom it must supply its iron ore. Rumania, intended to be the centre of a Balkan bloc, under the direction of Britain and France, has become a dependent of Hitler and Mussolini, who need its oil. Hungary, with its rich wheat production, is steadily more subject to the politics of the Axis. After fourteen months of war, three-fourths of Europe has fallen under the dominion of Hitler's and Mussolini's totalitarianism.

WHAT BRITISH RESISTANCE HAS DONE

It cannot be denied that if it were not for British resistance all of Europe, as well as its colonies and markets, would have fallen under the direction of Berlin and Rome. Stalinist Russia, allied with Germany, would have had to bow constantly lower to the will of the Axis. The consequences would have been catastrophic for humanity and primarily for the class that represents social and human progress—the proletariat. Not to recognise this fact would be to be blind to the evidence. British resistance has established the following objective factors:—

1. It has divided France profoundly, putting the great majority of the French people and a good part of its own bourgeoisie against the victors and their accomplices, the capitulators of Vichy. It has broken at the same time the relations between France and a part of its colonies. This two-fold result can lead to revolutionary consequences of extraordinary importance for the future.
2. It has removed the dangers which a rapid Hitler victory would have had for Stalinist Russia. This may safeguard Russia's political-social independence and its neo-imperialist conquests in Poland, Finland and the Baltic countries, which protect it to the West and North, and in Bessarabia and Bukovina which with the maintenance of the alliance with Turkey, protect it on the South. Stalin does not seem disposed as yet to break his pact with Hitler; openly he will not make the slightest gesture against Hitler, not, at least, whilst the Fuehrer is strong and has possibilities of victory. British resistance permits Stalin to continue his double game, which combines approaches to the U.S.A. and Britain with negotiations for new deals with Hitler. Stalin's chief preoccupation seems to be to extort the greatest possible advantage from the war, avoiding at all costs direct intervention.

3. It has permitted Greece, allied with Britain, to face the attack of Italian troops. The Italo-Greek war changes the field of battle from La Manche to the Mediterranean, which means the first lost battle for Hitler. Greek resistance, supported by Britain, constitutes an important factor in the disintegration of Italy, whose people are obviously against war.
4. It has permitted the evolution of North American public opinion in favour of Britain and against the Axis Powers, especially after the signing of their Treaty with Japan. Roosevelt, strengthened by his re-election, will intensify U.S. assistance, as well as preparations for direct intervention, with the aim of imposing the conditions for peace when the time comes. American Imperialism understands that not only are the possibilities of future expansion at stake, but also the very basis of its economic system, which, in the event of a German-Japanese-Italian victory, would face a crisis greater than that of 1929.
5. It has obliged Hitler and Mussolini to sign a pact with Tokyo, to extend its field of battle and to prepare for a long war, whose solution it is not possible to foresee. The only thing evident is that all the reserves which the capitalist régime still possesses will be thrown into the struggle.

WHERE IS EUROPE GOING ?

The British resistance is destined to provoke the following situations:—

- (a) The internal ruin and disintegration of Germany and Italy, materially and morally. This is already destroying the effects of victories previously achieved and demonstrating increasingly that the Hitler and Mussolini régimes are far from invulnerable and that the war and its sacrifices will not be ended except by the action of the masses.
- (b) The intensification of resistance by the nations now dominated by Hitler and Mussolini and the development of this resistance to the phase of an open fight for national and social independence.

This struggle has already become somewhat important in Spain, where the opposition to participation in the war on the side of Hitler and Mussolini has a double aspect—first, a grave crisis in the régime, which has led the monarchist elements, part of the military elements, and some of the Catalan and Basque bourgeoisie into opposition to the Falangist bureaucracy; and second, the silent struggle of the more conscious and advanced popular elements, translated into a series of acts of sabotage.

In Czechoslovakia, Holland and Norway the Hitler authorities find themselves compelled to intensify repressive measures, which demonstrates the resistance being made.

- (c) The beginning of a serious general crisis of the entire capitalist system and of conditions of revolutionary maturity in the imperialist countries, and among the colonial masses. The simultaneous weakening and disintegration of Italy and Germany and of the British Empire will develop this.

NO ALLIANCE WITH IMPERIALISM

The Chinese resistance to Japan, the development of national and social consciousness in India, and the breaking away of a large part of the French colonies from the Vichy Government and of the Dutch and Belgian colonies from Hitler-dominated Holland and Belgium, constitute important factors in the same direction.

British resistance is, therefore, objectively a revolutionary factor. But so also is the war itself, in so far as it aggravates extremely the contradictions of the capitalist régime and leads it into a crisis which may mean its death.

It would be a most serious error, however, to subject and adapt our political and consciously revolutionary positions to the vulgar empiricism of these objective factors. Not for the sake of opening up objectively revolutionary possibilities could we contribute to the unchaining of war or give help, directly or indirectly, to the Hitler victories. This sad rôle was reserved for Stalin.

Can we to-day, under the pretext of fighting Hitler and of "saving democracy," identify or ally ourselves in any form with British Imperialism? We cannot do this without betraying our class positions and without falling into a suicidal opportunism. And nothing can ever justify the betrayal of class positions by international Socialists.

In all political-social positions there is always a greater and a lesser evil. In every war there is one side whose victory presents itself as the lesser evil for civilisation and progress. Social Democracy has continuously determined its politics not in conformity with the interests and positions of the working-class, but under the influence of this argument of the lesser evil. And experience has been conclusive. The lesser evil has always served for the abandonment of class positions; it has led inevitably to the greater evil.

The most conclusive experience of all was that of 1914-18. The Plekhanovs, the Guesdes, the Vanderveldes ceded to the lesser evil, to the necessity to defend democracy, liberty and justice against Kaiserism and Teutonic barbarism. It was the Zimmerwald minority that saved the honour and banner of Socialism in the midst of the catastrophe and collapse of the Labour Movement.

The working-class of every country should defend its democratic conquests when they are threatened by totalitarianism. But this does not mean at all that the working-class should identify itself with "bourgeois democracy": on the contrary, it

should demonstrate that "bourgeois democracy," because of its incapacity and impotence, only serves to cover the march toward Fascism.

The question, "Democracy or Fascism?" serves only to deceive the working-class, to turn it away from class lines, to disarm it, while the bourgeoisie with the collaboration of Social Democracy prepares the bed for Fascism. The only question for the working-class is "Socialism or Fascism?" that is to say, they can defend their democratic conquests and the remnants of liberty which they enjoy only by class means and in the service of class aims, namely the realisation of revolutionary and Socialist democracy.

In Britain at war, the working class should defend energetically the degree of democratic liberty which it still possesses, but without identifying itself on that account with British Imperialism. It should, on the contrary, fight through its own means and for its own cause, taking advantage in this struggle of all the difficulties and the weakness of the régime.

In opposing bourgeois democracy by socialist democracy, in opposing imperialist peace by socialist peace, the British workers help the struggle of the German proletariat, as well as the French proletariat and the proletariat of the rest of the nations now oppressed by Hitlerism, against the régimes that have enslaved them and dragged them to war. By identifying themselves with the cause of British Imperialism, the British workers not only renounce their class independence and disarm themselves, politically, but also contribute to the disarming of the German proletariat and the strengthening consequently of Hitlerist Imperialism.

THE PROPER TACTIC

The British proletariat can only aspire to class solidarity with the German proletariat in the struggle against Hitlerism on condition that it proves its readiness to resist British Imperialism, which, in agreement with N. American and French Imperialism would, if victorious, undoubtedly impose on Germany a new Versailles.

Does this mean that the British proletariat should give itself over to sabotage, with the object of undermining the resistance of the country? No, this would be a too mechanical application of revolutionary defeatism which would in practice turn against itself.

The proper tactics in the present concrete situation is to separate with all clarity the cause and objectives of the imperialist bourgeoisie from the cause and objectives of the proletariat, always attempting to give to the British resistance a revolutionary and socialist content and aim, not only to its own advantage and to the advantage of the colonial peoples, but also to the advantage of the German and international proletariat.

India's Terms

Naturally we demand independence for ourselves. But we have made it clear that we stand for a new world order, and India will gladly co-operate in some fashioning of the world's affairs. This can only be satisfactorily done on the basis of peace, freedom and democracy. . . .

Therefore it becomes essential that India and China should have freedom and democracy. Otherwise there will be no satisfactory political or economic settlement and the present want of equilibrium and conflict will continue. It is obvious that the tremendous resources, both actual and potential, of India and China must play an important part in the world affairs.

You know the attitude that we have taken in regard to the European war. We have always been opposed to the Fascist and Nazi doctrine and have condemned all aggression. If we had been sure that the present war was a conflict between freedom on the one side and Nazism on the other, we would gladly have thrown our weight on the side of freedom. But the invitation we issued to the British Government for a statement of war aims and for the treatment of India as a free country met with a rebuff and it was clear to us that this war is essentially meant for the preservation of British imperialism. For this objective we cannot agree to the utilisation of our men and resources.

If we are against Nazism, we are also against imperialism. This war, as it is at present being waged, seems to us a conflict between rival imperialisms, and we can be no party to it unless it is made clear that the objective is freedom and democracy. That can only be made clear by the treatment accorded to India.

Our demand is a simple one, though it raises fundamental issues. We want the declaration of Indian independence and the recognition of the right of the Indian people to frame their constitution through a Constituent Assembly without any interference from outside. If this is done, we feel that the whole fabric of British imperialism, as well as other imperialisms, will undergo a vital change and imperialism itself will be liquidated.

This is the message I should like you to take to our friends. As you know, the present situation in India is very unstable and at any moment there may be serious developments. Whatever these developments might be, we shall hold to these objectives and struggle to achieve them.

The minorities problem has been made to appear as an obstruction in the way of our freedom. But in reality this is not so, for we are prepared to give every conceivable guarantee to the minorities in India within the limits of democracy, freedom and Indian unity.

READY ON FEBRUARY 10th

JAMES KEIR HARDIE

AN IMPORTANT NEW BIOGRAPHICAL
SKETCH by

G. D. H. COLE

1/-

(1/1½d. Post Free)

Order from

THE SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP
35 ST. BRIDE STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

SOCIALIST VOTES IN THE U.S.A

We have now received information on how the various Left Wing Parties fared in the American Presidential elections.

The Socialist Party, whose Candidate was Norman Thomas, polled 116,796 votes. In addition to this number a considerable number of voters who "write-in" were disqualified because the Socialist Candidate was denied a place in some State ballots. Comparative figures of Socialist votes in the present and previous campaign were as follow:—

	1940	1936
California (unofficial)	18,000	11,600
Illinois	10,914	7,530
Kansas	2,347	2,766
Maryland	4,000	1,629
Massachusetts	5,000	5,111
Michigan	7,600	8,208
Minnesota	6,000	2,872
Montana	1,100	1,066
New Jersey	2,300	3,895
New York	20,500	86,879
*Wisconsin	15,071	10,626

*The Wisconsin increase puts the party officially back on the ballot in that important state.

The Communist Party polled 47,861 votes and the Socialist Labour Party 14,861.

RED RECORD

FEBRUARY, 1934—FEBRUARY, 1941

Seven years of Socialist Aggression
from
LITERATURE STALL
to
**SOCIALIST
BOOK CENTRE**

•
**350,000 Customers Served
1,100,000 copies of Socialist
Books and Pamphlets sold
(including 11,000 "Guilty Men")**

•
and
25 million men and women
still to be won over

•
**THE SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP
35 St. Bride St., London, E.C.4**

The Citadel of Socialist Freethought