

# THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SOCIAL FASCISM

By M.M.

THE "Class against Class" policy which has been the main line of the British Communist Party since 1928 has been accepted and confirmed by the party in several documents, articles and resolutions. On the whole there is no open objection in the ranks of the party to this line.

It cannot be denied that the leadership of the British Communist Party elected at the Leeds Party Conference in 1929 has tried its utmost to put this line into practice. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that in the party's activity among the masses, especially of late, there have been several cases of direct distortion of the "Class against Class" policy. The party leadership itself has made several serious mistakes in contradiction and violation of this line, and of the Bolshevik struggles against all varieties and tendencies of, British social-fascism. Certain of these mistakes are so serious that in order to assure that the line of the Party and the Comintern will be carried out in practice, and in order to educate the party on the basis of an analysis of its mistakes, we must investigate and explain in detail the most important mistakes of this kind made by the *British Party*.

*Is the Labour Party a barrier between reaction and revolution? Or is it a composite part of the Reactionary Front?*

One would imagine that after so much discussion and explanation in the ranks of the Communist International on the question of social fascism, the chief social support of the bourgeoisie, this question should be clear to every Communist.

In England the reformist assertions that the Labour Party is a barrier between reaction (die-hard Conservatives) and revolution (the Communist Party) are still widely diffused among the working masses. The reformist leaders miss no opportunity of strengthening this illusion in the minds of the broad masses. During the election campaign all this deceit about the rôle of the Labour Party was the main political content of the most important speeches of the present leader of the Labour Party, Henderson. When Snowden during the elections accused the Labour Party of going over to Bolshevism, when it went into opposition, the main form of defence assumed by the "Daily Herald" was to emphasise the rôle of the Labour Party as the barrier between reaction and revolution.

The party, instead of doing its utmost in every possible way to expose the falsity of this argu-

ment, allowed expressions which actually supported the deceit of the "Daily Herald." For instance, we find the following in the open letter of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Great Britain to all members and supporters of the Labour Party (see the "Daily Worker" of November 12th, 1931):

"The National Government has an overwhelming majority; the Labour Party as the Parliamentary 'opposition' *standing between the workers and their masters the capitalists* (our italics—M.M.) is practically destroyed. In other words, the crisis of capitalism has considerably weakened the *buffer between the working class and the capitalists.*"

Opportunist formulations of this kind have been repeated in several other articles in the "Daily Worker." For example, in the "Daily Worker" of October 30th, 1931, we find the declaration of Henderson to the effect that the "Labour Party is the only barrier between reaction and revolution," accompanied by the following conclusion of the writer of the article: "Henderson is right."

We have proof that these mistakes are no accident, and that they are the result of lack of understanding of the rôle of social-fascism, in the fact that one could frequently hear declarations among Party members, especially after the elections, which actually placed the Labour Party in opposition to the united front of the capitalists. Members of the Communist Party frequently talked about three fronts during the elections: the Communist Party, the Conservatives, and the Labour Party members. There were no serious attempts made to explain to the masses all the essence of the deceit of the Labour Party, which took up the position of His Majesty's Opposition only in order to hold back the increasing militancy of the masses and keep them under its influence, at the same time itself remaining a *composite part* of the front of reaction.

It is clear that the bourgeoisie is vitally interested in the English workers continuing to look upon the Labour Party as their own party, which is alleged to fight against the capitalist parties: the Conservatives and Liberals. Their efforts in this direction are one of the reasons for all the noise, made by the entire bourgeois press after the elections, about the parliamentary defeat of the Labour Party. "The Conservatives have beaten the Labour Party," "the Conservatives have actually killed the Labour Party," and so on,



these declarations resounded throughout England. Certain of the Communists, not being clear on the question as to whether the Labour Party is a barrier between reaction and revolution or not, believed all this deceit, and hot on the heels of the bourgeois press, repeated the story of the destruction of the Labourites by the Conservatives.

Elections, in general, are an excellent manoeuvre on the part of the British bourgeoisie to deceive the workers. The Labour Party, thanks to the policy of the Labour Government, has rapidly begun to lose influence among the masses. The bourgeoisie wanted first of all to deceive the masses by an election campaign into believing that its programme of a capitalist way out of the crisis corresponds with the interests of the masses; secondly, to make sure that the tariff policy and other measures for further robbing the toiling masses would be re-examined, which in the existing circumstances would be more conveniently put through by forming a stable conservative majority in Parliament; and thirdly to make use of a split in the Labour Party, and the distribution of parts between MacDonald and Henderson, to thus ensure the further utilisation of the Labour Party in governmental administration; and at the same time give the Labour Party, which had gone into "opposition," the possibility of strengthening its unstable position among the masses.

There can be no suggestion that the British bourgeoisie and one of its parties, the Conservative Party, is interested in destroying the chief social mainstay of the bourgeoisie in England. Nothing of the kind.

Not to understand this means not to understand the Bolshevik estimation of the rôle of social-fascism; it amounts to falling into the social fascist position and defending the lying deceit which is being spread about the "barrier-rôle" of the Labour Party.

As a result of the fact that this problem has not been understood among the rank and file of the British Communist Party, there have arisen confused and dangerous formulations about the elections "breaking down the theoretical bases of Labourism." And this in spite of the fact that the theoretical bases of all kinds of social-fascism were long ago "broken down" by the theory of Marxism and Leninism. But does this mean that the influence of Labourism has been undermined among the masses? What have the British elections to do with this?

## 2.—THE THEORY OF THE LESSER EVIL.

We find, in close connection with several mistakes on the question of the Labour Party as a composite part of the reactionary front, and its

rôle in the work of building up a Fascist State, the fact that the party made no attempt to fight against the theory of the "lesser evil" in connection with concrete circumstances in England. The struggle against the theory of the lesser evil cannot be reduced to a repetition of quotations from decisions of the Eleventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. on the need for revealing this main argument of the reformists, by means of which they try to justify all their treachery. And yet in actual fact the party (including the leadership) in its fight against the Labour Party and the Independent Labour Party and in unmasking the reformist theories of the "lesser evil" actually went no further than a general repetition of quotations from the decisions of the Eleventh E.C.C.I. Plenum.

Immediately after the Eleventh Plenum the party should have made a study of the specific "English" arguments on the reformist theory of the "lesser evil" and explained them to the masses. The actual experience of two "Labour" Governments, of the activities of the leaders of the Labour Party, the Independent Labour Party and the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, give the party several examples, facts and arguments with which to reveal the deception of the reformists before the masses with success. The party has not unmasked the English form of the "theory of the lesser evil" either systematically or on a broad scale. For instance: the leading motive of all the agitation of the Labour Party is that a government of the Labour Party plus the Liberals is better than a government of Conservatives (this before the formation of the "National Government"); that a Cabinet of Conservatives plus Liberals plus MacDonald is "better" than a government formed entirely of Conservatives (this after the formation of the "National Government"). Again it is sufficient to indicate that the party did not link up the general slogan of the reformists, "Equality of Sacrifice" (used by Henderson and other reformist leaders to explain to the masses the need for cutting down the unemployment dole and the wages of the soldiers, sailors and government employees), with the theory of the "lesser evil"; neither did it unmask this slogan sufficiently in general. The theory of the "lesser evil" is the main argument of the whole policy and practice of the trade union leaders when they make wide use of the method of arbitration and secret negotiations, and persuade the workers, often successfully, not to strike because they have won certain insignificant reductions in the original demands of the owners. This is also the "lesser evil"! In his speech at the Bristol Trade Union Congress,



Henderson in the name of the theory of the "lesser evil" tried to prove to the workers the need for introducing tariffs all round when he said: "I prefer the introduction of all-round tariffs to a cut in the unemployment relief."

Many hundreds of thousands of workers voted at the last elections for the Labour Party, led, for the most part, by the question as to who was the "worst evil." Since the Communist Party put up candidates in only 25 constituencies out of 612, and the masses of workers, in spite of the increased attitude of sympathy towards the Communist Party, did not believe that the Communist Party candidates would be elected, in the majority of cases, they chose between the "two evils": between the Labour Party and the Conservatives, and in the majority of cases they voted for the "lesser evil."

All these specifically English varieties of the theory of the "lesser evil" were not seriously studied by the party or explained to the masses.

Moreover the party made several mistakes in its work, which not only made the fight against these theories more difficult, but actually brought grist to the mill of the reformists.

In their speeches against the Labourites and the Independent Labour Party leaders, the English Communists sometimes used formulations and arguments which directly supported the deceit of the social-fascists based on the aforementioned arguments of the lesser evil. For example, the Communists often declared: The Labour Party and the Independent Labour Party are parties of reform, and the Communist Party is the party of revolution. Thus, for example, immediately after the elections the "Daily Worker" in its issue of November 12th, 1931, characterised the policy of the Labour Party as follows: "continual reforms, continual improvement in the position of the working class, leading up to the peaceful transition to Socialism." It is quite clear that gross opportunist mistakes like this gave the reformists another opportunity of justifying their policy and practice of pacifying the workers, with promises of new reforms.

In this connection it should be mentioned that there is an enormous amount of confusion in the heads of many Communists on the question of the relationship which exists between reforms and revolution; on the question of reforms as a by-product of the revolutionary movement; of the Communist tactic of putting forward partial demands for the purpose of defending the daily demands of the workers and in order to further revolutionise the proletariat; of the social function of reformism in particular.

We find very widespread in the party the policy the eclectic opinion that reformism is the

inevitable satellite of "progressive" capitalism, of the first period of capitalist development. The opinion is widespread that capitalism could make concessions, could agree to give reforms, etc., in those days. One of the editors of the organ of the Minority Movement, the "Worker," Comrade Berridge, writes, for instance: "Is the reformist policy, which is the official policy of the trade union and Labour Party leaders, and which was born in the period of capitalist prosperity, still a weapon in the hands of the workers now, in the period of the downfall of capitalism? This is the main question" ("The Worker," January 16th, 1932). According to Comrade Berridge it appears that reformism was a weapon in the hands of the workers in the period of capitalist prosperity and was not always—as the Bolsheviks consider—the influence of the bourgeoisie upon the working class, was not always the policy of the whole *bourgeois strata* inside the ranks of the proletariat—of the aristocracy of labour, bought over by the British bourgeoisie by means of imperialist super-profits, gained as a result of Britain's prolonged position of monopoly on the world market.

It is obvious that it is impossible to launch a determined, acute struggle, to overcome the influence of reformism among the working masses with views of this kind on the question of reformism. For if reformism was the policy of the workers during the period of capitalist prosperity, and if now the "theoretical bases of Labourism are destroyed," then everything will go along all right, and the masses will themselves come to the camp of Communism.

Conclusions of this kind were actually arrived at in the party during the last elections. Among the rank and file of the party membership there existed the opinion that the main characteristic feature of the last elections is the exit of two million electors from the camp of the Labour leaders. In the discussions on this question the most important thing—the 6½ million votes cast for the Labour Party—was hidden behind the other two million. *Yet the revolution in England is impossible without the destruction of the still existing mass influence of Labourism.*

On the question of unmasking the rôle of the Labour Party in the formation of the National Government, both in the "Daily Worker" and in other forms of activity of the party, many cases can be given where the party strengthened the illusions of the workers on the question of the "lesser evil." For instance, on the eve of the elections the "Daily Worker" wrote that the Labour Party, while still in the Government, itself prepared and began to put through nine-tenths of the cuts in the unemployment relief and wages.



Hence the mistaken formula was born, that the "Labour Party is nine-tenths opposition."

Thus we once more helped to spread illusions about the lesser evil. Thus the workers could, and without a doubt did, imagine the position as follows: in the main there are two forces—the Labourites and Conservatives. The Communists cannot be taken into account because they have no representation in parliament, and on the whole are still very weak. Both parties are for cuts in wages and unemployment relief. But the Labour Party people are not so hard on the workers as the Conservatives; they are for cuts (the theory of equality for sacrifice from all sections of the population), but, nevertheless, for smaller cuts. They are therefore the lesser evil.

When after the downfall of the second Labour Government the leadership of the Labour Party split, the "Daily Worker" again unmasked the Labour Party (which had gone into opposition) from the wrong point of view. Our paper again saw only one side of the affair when MacDonald was excluded from the Labour Party and Thomas relieved of his duties as Secretary of the Railwaymen's Union: increased radicalisation, increased indignation on the part of Labour Party supporters at the open betrayal of their leaders. The "Daily Worker" of September 2nd, 1931, wrote as follows: "The removal of Thomas from his position as political secretary of the Railwaymen's Union is an extremely important event in the history of the Labour movement." The other side of this tactic of the reformists: the distribution of parts between MacDonald and Henderson was not consistently revealed by the "Daily Worker."

After the parliamentary victory of the Conservatives, the party took the correct line of showing up the National Government as the Government of Hunger and War and a determined offensive against the working class along the whole front. But even here, in spite of the fact that it correctly emphasised the fact that the Labour Party prepared for the advent to power of the "nationalists," incorrect formulations were made which actually placed the National Government on one side and the Labour Party leaders on the opposite side. For example, one day after the election the "Daily Worker" said that the National Government was "ten times worse than the Labour Government." Our incorrect statements again led the workers to the position of the theory of the "lesser evil."

### 3.—THE UNITED FRONT TACTIC.

In spite of the numerous decisions of International Congresses and Conferences on the need for adopting the united front tactic *only* from

below, there have been cases in England of attempts to apply this tactic towards the Independent Labour Party at the top, with its leaders. Among attempts of this kind we must include the joint meeting of representatives of the Communist Party, the Independent Labour Party and the revolutionary organisation of the unemployed, which took place on September 23rd, 1931, and which was attended by Comrades Rust, Hannington, Arnot and others, as well as leaders of the Independent Labour Party like Maxton, Fenner Brockway and Kirkwood. In the pamphlet which gives the report of this meeting, "The Workers' United Front and the I.L.P.," the aim of the meeting is formulated thus: "Discussion on the question of how to create a united front of the working class." Of course, the leading comrades of the Communist Party of Great Britain did not aim at creating a united front between Maxton and the Communist Party, but the very fact of the meeting being called, the fact that a discussion took place at the meeting about the formation of a united front with the I.L.P., is the decisive factor in giving an estimate of the meeting itself. For, in the eyes of the masses, this meeting was looked upon as an attempt to "come to an agreement," an attempt to form a united front among the leaders. And this is the main thing in forming an estimate of each tactical step, each manoeuvre taken by the party. True, the representatives of the Communist Party spoke against the I.L.P. leaders at the meeting, they made declarations to the effect that an unbridgeable gulf lies between the I.L.P. and the Communist Party, etc., but all this in no way alters the fact that the masses saw, and still see, in meetings of this kind, an attempt to "come to an agreement" between the two organisations. Thus we have helped to strengthen the illusion that the Independent Labour Party is also a workers' party, which fights against the offensive of the owners.

Even before this meeting there were private meetings between certain Communists in leading positions in the revolutionary organisations of the unemployed and representatives of the I.L.P. Meetings of this kind should be considered a serious political mistake. The party leadership did not evince the essential Bolshevik irreconcilability which it should have done towards the activities of individual party members; and at best it should be blamed for intolerable tardiness as regards correcting these mistakes.

Other mistakes, like that of permitting "left" I.L.P. Members of Parliament like Brown and Strachey to speak side by side with our speakers at Communist meetings, should also be brought



under the same heading of confusion concerning the united front tactic from below and above.

In several locals, conferences on the basis of the united front from below were held, in which representatives of the rank and file organisations of the I.L.P. also took an active part. The latter agreed with all our proposals, slogans, methods of struggle; took part in our demonstrations, meetings, and the struggle against the police. There is no doubt that in the majority of cases these rank and file members of the I.L.P. represent radicalised sections of the workers. But very often our comrades brought about a united front from below in connection with certain concrete slogans of action and let it rest there; quite forgetting that this is not enough. It is most important to get a united front from below, but the task of Communists is to continue, even in cases like this, to unmask the I.L.P., the Labour Party and the General Council, and even to unmask them more determinedly than before. This has not always been done. There have even been cases when our comrades quite consciously decided not to go beyond the limit of the programme of action accepted by the Independent Labour Party members. This is, without doubt, an opportunist mistake which approximates to the viewpoint of the I.L.P. leaders of the need for a "truce" during joint action.

In cases like this the masses are again prevented from seeing the deep difference in principle between the Communist Party and the I.L.P. The workers in the given locality, when no permanent unmasking of the I.L.P. and its leaders takes place, see only the operation of a united front from below; they see that the Communist Party and the I.L.P. are fighting together for the immediate demands of the masses. Thus, by using the united front tactic from below in this way, we get just the opposite results to those which we are seeking to obtain: and we seek to obtain the operation of the united front among the masses in their struggles side by side with the unmasking of the I.L.P. The first must on no account be separated from the second.

#### 4.—IS IT RIGHT TO CONSIDER THE ACTIONS OF THE REFORMIST LEADERS AS "MISTAKES"?

On this question as well, there is some confusion in the ranks of our brother party in Great Britain. Frequently our comrades in trying to reveal the true nature of the leaders of the Labour Party and the I.L.P. refer to this or that statement or action on their part as a mistake. By doing this we objectively strengthen the existing illusions among the masses, that it is not a case of treachery on the part of the leaders, not a case of their putting through their own policy in which

a whole section of the working class, bought over by the bourgeoisie (the aristocracy of labour) are vitally interested. Not that they cannot or will not put through any other policy, but it is simply that they are everlastingly "making mistakes."

For instance, during the election campaign, especially after the resignation of the second "Labour" Government, our party criticised the Labour Party for not fighting, for not calling the masses to action on the streets, in the workshops, etc. In the first leading article of the "Daily Worker" after the elections we find: "Instead of one class replying to the attacks of the other class, the Labour Party leaders have done all they can to prevent the workers from understanding their class tasks and understanding the need for struggling against capitalism" ("Daily Worker," October 29th, 1931).

On the basis of this sort of "unmasking" of Labourism, the workers, especially the supporters of the Labour Party, can and no doubt do get the impression that this is not a question of some sort of line, of systematically defending the capitalist system, and imperialism, as the reformists do who represent the interests of the aristocracy of labour; they get the impression that this is not a question of inevitable treachery on the part of the reformists, but simply a question of their mistakes: "instead of one thing," instead of one tactic, the leaders used some other tactic. When the worst comes to the worst they have simply made a mistake. This is the effect of our mistakes in the work of struggling against the Labour Party among the masses.

We must begin to learn from Lenin how to make each of our speeches and articles thoroughly true both theoretically and in principle. The importance of mistakes of this kind must not be belittled by statements to the effect that they are merely the result of unfortunate wording. It is not merely a question of the "effect." For estimates of this kind concerning the behaviour of the Communist Party does not correspond with our idea of the social basis of the Labour Party (the aristocracy of labour, bought over by imperialist super-profits and certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns, etc.), or of the organic connection between these sections and the imperialist bourgeoisie and their policy.

For this reason the wording in Comrade Maurice Ferguson's article, for instance (see the "Daily Worker" of November 3rd, 1931), to the effect that the "I.L.P. in Birmingham is a loose political organisation" is quite incorrect. It cannot be said that the I.L.P. is something confused, indefinite, heterogeneous. Nothing of the kind. It is just this apparent, outward, "confusion" and "shapelessness" of the I.L.P. which makes



up the sort of party best suited to safeguard the functions of the I.L.P. in its work of subjecting the proletariat to the influence of the bourgeoisie, and of deceiving the masses by the use of revolutionary phrases, and by its liberal attitude to the "almost Communist" activities inside the I.L.P. itself; it is just this that makes the I.L.P. attractive to the masses who have swung to the left, and keeps the latter from passing forward to the camp of Communism.

The actions of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party must not be called "stupid." This is absolutely incorrect and politically harmful, for declarations of this kind are able to strengthen the illusion which exists among Labour Party supporters that it is enough to correct the "mistakes" of the leaders, to make them "wise," and everything will be all right.

In view of this, the estimate given by Comrade Rust, concerning the article of Brailsford, a "left" leader of the I.L.P., during the course of the meeting mentioned above between representatives of the Communist Party and the I.L.P., is quite wrong. Comrade Rust said: "It is the most stupid, the most misleading article for the working class." The second part of the statement is correct, but the first part is mistaken. Nothing is said or written by the leaders of the I.L.P. out of "stupidity." They do everything in the interests of deceiving the masses. The task of the Communists is not to show up the apparent "stupidities" of the I.L.P. leaders, but to show up their betrayal of the workers, their efforts to prevent the workers from going over to the side of the Communist Party; to prove to the masses that behind every "mistake" or apparent piece of "stupidity" the reformist leaders hide up their general *line* of treachery.

#### HOW TO UNMASK THE I.L.P. LEADERS.

We frequently find in the documents and articles of the Communist Party of Great Britain quite correct statements to the effect that the I.L.P. is the biggest, most dangerous enemy of the proletariat in the ranks of the Labour movement.

With this Leninist conception as the starting point, the party tries to show up the actions and the real essence of the I.L.P. leaders.

But in the work of unmasking the I.L.P. leaders most serious mistakes have been made by individual comrades and organisations.

Here are a few examples.

In Glasgow, where the indignation of the masses already expresses itself in demonstrations 100,000 strong, which take place under the leadership of the Communist Party, the District Party Committee issued leaflets which were intended to "show up" the "left" I.L.P. leaders, all of whom had met in Glasgow for the purpose

of gaining control of the growing mass movement. The leaflet contains the Communist platform of action ("not a penny off wages, support to the unemployed," etc.) and then a statement to the effect that if the declarations of the "left" I.L.P. leaders in Parliament are not a pre-election manoeuvre, and if they really agree with these demands of the masses, then they can prove this to be the case by taking part in the present struggle and demonstrations.

First of all, there was no need to issue leaflets addressed to the leaders of the I.L.P. Secondly, the leaflets are written in a style which leads one to imagine that the I.L.P. *as well* is a workers' party fighting for the workers' interests, and that it is all just a question of participation in demonstrations on the basis of a few slogans. Thirdly, it is a serious mistake to invite these I.L.P. leaders to take part in the present struggle and so give them a platform from which they can give their message to the masses.

From the viewpoint of how the masses would understand this leaflet, this sort of "unmasking" of the I.L.P. leaders is wrong, since it does not unmask them but puts them on an equal footing with the Communist Party, and prevents the workers from understanding the deep difference of principle between the I.L.P. and the Communist Party.

When militant demonstrations of the unemployed took place in London, the demonstrators, led by our comrades, after a fight with the police in Parliament Square, elected a deputation to Parliament. This deputation was received by the "left" I.L.P. leaders. The bourgeois press wrote that the demonstrators elected a delegation for the purpose of negotiating with "its Members."

Again we find the impression left in the minds of the masses that the I.L.P. is *also* their working-class party. True it is not so revolutionary as the Communist Party, but it is a working-class party, since even the Communists, after several hours' fighting against the police, sent their delegation to the Parliamentary members of that party.

The source of these mistakes lies in a lack of understanding of the rôle of the I.L.P. despite the verbal repetition of phrases about the I.L.P. being the most dangerous enemy. For instance, in Glasgow there are comrades who objected to putting up a party candidate in the constituency of the well-known "left" I.L.P.er, John McGovern, for the simple reason that he, after all, is a "left," he "takes part in our demonstrations," he "fights against the police," and, after all, the "masses would not understand." This is in actual fact opportunist distortion of the "class against class" policy.



The I.L.P. must not be looked upon as a potential ally of the Communist Party; it is just this that the "left" leaders of the I.L.P. would like. Why, Maxton said quite frankly at the above-mentioned joint meeting with representatives of the Communist Party: "If we could cross out our differences of opinion and leave aside the theoretical division—this would be the first big step towards correct behaviour in present conditions . . . We should, if only for one month, show the workers that we are not a mass of collaborating sectarians." Fenner Brockway, another I.L.P. leader, gave the game away when he said: "A big mass movement makes collaboration possible. The old spirit of antagonism must disappear."

Yes, a big mass movement developing along the road to Communism is the thing which has made the I.L.P. suddenly talk about a united front with the Communist Party, about the need for a "truce," about the need for "postponing" discussion on "theoretical" differences of opinion.

And instead of driving these people out from the mass movement once and for all because they are the most dangerous inner enemies of the working class, we find our comrades making mistakes which actually lead the masses to believe that the Communist Party invites the I.L.P. leaders to take part in this movement. Because of our mistakes the I.L.P. is represented to the masses as a possible, a potential, ally of communism; as a force which differs from the Communist Party only in the degree to which it is revolutionary ("not so revolutionary"!).

In Islington, London, the I.L.P. parliamentary candidate agreed to our slogans of action in written form; agreed to take part in our demonstrations; and it ended with our comrades actually giving this candidate a tribune from which she could hold forth among the unemployed masses.

Similar mistakes were made in Wigan and Rochdale (Lancashire), where the Communist Party in order to organise a mass movement of the unemployed against the Means Test proposed to the local organisations of the I.L.P. to take part in the organisation of a movement of this kind. Of course, the I.L.P. readily agreed. In one of these two towns a joint committee was formed, and in the other three representatives of the I.L.P. and only one Communist spoke from the same platform at a large mass meeting. In both these cases the mistakes become particularly important and obvious in view of the fact that the Communist Party could have organised this mass movement without the I.L.P., to whom, as it was, we gave the chance of getting to the masses.

In Dumbarton in Scotland at very large demonstrations of the unemployed, the local I.L.P.

leaders also spoke. In the course of their speeches they asked their supporters not to heckle the Communist orators. The latter, in turn, continued this liberal game of politics and also called upon the masses not to heckle the I.L.P. speakers. In the given case our comrades not only make a serious mistake, but by their very behaviour proved that they have not by any means freed themselves from bourgeois influences which express themselves in Parliamentary liberal toleration towards their antagonists.

In explaining the rôle of the Labour Party and I.L.P. leaders, our comrades frequently forget to explain to party supporters that we consider reformism our chief enemy not abstractly, but concretely in the struggle against the chief enemy of the working class: against the capitalists. Consequently we find that the struggle of the Communists against the Labour Party and the I.L.P. is often quite divorced from the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

\* \* \*

We might mention several other mistakes no less important than those already cited, but space does not permit us to do so.

The mistakes made by the party in connection with the fight against social democracy show that there is not yet sufficient clarity in the ranks of the party on all those questions which are contained in the problem of the Party and Social Democracy.

The rôle of the Labour Party as the chief social support of the British bourgeoisie, the form in which the Labour Party is becoming fascist, the various forms in which the reformists have adapted the theory of the lesser evil, the rôle of the I.L.P. as the most dangerous enemy of the revolution inside the working-class movement, and several other radical questions of tactics and struggle,—all these questions must be carefully and profoundly studied by the English party. As the starting point to a study of these questions the party should use the international decisions which embody the Leninist theory of social-fascism and, in particular, centrism (for instance, questions raised by Comrade Stalin in his article\*); they should make use of all the mistakes that have been made in order that *all party members* should thoroughly understand the party line.

The party should evince true Bolshevik intolerance to mistakes of this kind. A determined fight should be put up against all those who persist in mistakes of this sort.

As to the question of the source of these mistakes and the reasons underlying them (especially left reformist and legalist tendencies), a special article will have to be devoted to this.

\* See No. 20 Communist International, "Questions regarding the History of Bolshevism," by Stalin.