

bureaucracy use the Church in holding down the masses; not for nothing did Russian Imperialism utilise religion in its depredations.

This, then, was the state of the Russian Empire when Lenin and his party addressed themselves to the task of capturing power and liberating the Russian and Colonial peoples of the East from the Czarist 'prison of nations.'

CHAPTER THREE

HOW LENIN SOLVED THE COLONIAL QUESTION

"NO NATION can be free if it oppresses other nations."

This statement of Marx and Engels, the founders of Scientific Socialism, is a clear formulation of the fundamental principle of Self-Determination for colonial peoples, the implementation of which Lenin, their greatest disciple, achieved in 1917. This achievement still remains one of the most outstanding successes of the Russian Revolution, and provides a living example to the British, American, French, Dutch and other imperialist nations still faced with the task of finding a solution to their colonial and national minority problems.

Realising that "the socialists cannot reach their great aim without fighting against any form of national oppression," Lenin and his followers not only made themselves the champions of the Russian workers and peasants, but consistently advocated the liberation of all the non-Russian peoples of the Czarist Empire, regardless of their degree of social and cultural development. "The socialist of a great country or nation possessing colonies who does not defend this right is a chauvinist," taught Lenin. "To defend this right does in no way mean to encourage the formation of small States, but on the contrary it leads to a freer, more fearless and therefore wider and more universal form of government and unions of government—a phenomenon more advantageous for the masses and more in accord with economic development."¹

The correctness of this political principle is proved by the solidarity of the Soviet peoples in the present crisis. Furthermore, its rightness and the need for its extension is observable in the aspirations of the peoples of the smaller European States to political independence, now being expressed in the current plans for federated groups on the continent.

¹ Lenin and Zinoviev: *Socialism and War*, Little Lenin Library, Vol. 3, p. 25.

But let us see how the many diverse nationalities of the Czarist Empire were compounded into an economic and political unity with the Russian people, to form a multi-national State to be known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Lenin was the most realistic of idealists. To wish to bring about socialism was all very well, but he perceived the necessity to establish a party which would be the instrument for achieving this objective. Having founded his party (the Bolsheviks), he proceeded to impregnate it with the philosophy of Revolutionary Marxism. This he enriched with his own unparalleled knowledge, based upon his critique of Imperialism,¹ the epoch upon which he was to leave an indelible imprint.

The Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, at a conference in London in 1903, split into two sections on organisational issues of great moment, but the consideration of which is outside the scope of this study. From this conference Lenin emerged as the leader of the majority section—the Bolsheviks. The other fraction was known as the Mensheviks, or minority. From then until his death, Lenin was the undisputed master of his party. The division at the 1903 conference thus laid the foundation of the instrument which was not many years later to sweep Imperialism from one-sixth of the earth—to open wide the gates of ‘the prison of nations.’ And Lenin set about the task of infusing his followers with the will to power, a spirit entirely lacking in the British Labour Party, which has now become an appendage of Tory Imperialism.

Bolsheviks The Revolutionary Vanguard.

Lenin's conception of the Bolsheviks was as the vanguard, the most conscious section of the working class, the industrial proletariat. But the Russian Empire, as we have seen, was overwhelmingly agricultural, with the peasants forming the preponderant majority of the population. Moreover, the subject nationalities of the Empire were an integral part of the structure of Czarism, and no solution of the social problem of the workers of Russia Proper was possible which did not include within its scope the liberation of the great

¹ *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism.*

masses of the colonial peoples from the yoke of Imperialism. The emancipation of the Russian workers could not be separated from the agrarian revolution and the national liberation movement. The principle of Self-Determination was therefore woven web and warp into the fight for the social emancipation of the workers of the metropolitan country.

Such an alliance between the white advanced workers in the ‘mother’ country and the coloured peoples in the colonial territories of the Empire has never been even remotely entertained by the British Labour Movement, as the leaders of the British working class think, not in terms of a fundamental social and political change of the British Imperialist system, but merely of securing reforms within the framework of the present Capitalist-Imperialist system. Consequently, they look upon the Colonial Empire as a necessary adjunct to the industrialised metropolis in which they function. Out of this conception there is now issuing a new school of ‘Fabian reformers’ who are propagating the fallacy that all the subject races of the Colonial Empire need and want is bigger and better Colonial Development and Welfare schemes, to be carried out by the same Whitehall bureaucrats and Colonial pro-Consuls who for centuries have kept the native peoples ‘in their place’ while British capitalists, traders, settlers and industrialists have exploited their lands and cheap unorganised labour.¹

‘Socialist’ humbug of this kind was firmly repudiated by Lenin and his followers, who addressed themselves to the task of working out a concrete programme of action for solving the Colonial Question in the Czarist Empire down to its roots.

In the process of probing the National Minority and Colonial Question, in order to establish where lay its roots and what gave rise to the oppressive conditions which are an inseparable concomitant of all colonial systems, Lenin found it necessary to explore the ramifications of finance-capital as it operated on a world scale. Out of his studies, based largely upon the writings of Rudolf Hilferding² and J. A.

¹ See the 1944 Labour Party Manifesto: *The Old World and the New Society*, Sect. 5, p. 20.

² Rudolf Hilferding: Financial expert of the German Social Democratic Party. Principal work: *Das Finanz Kapital*, 1910.

Hobson,¹ came that great work, *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Capitalism had become international, monopolies had been established on a world-wide scale, and colonial and semi-colonial countries like Africa, India, China, etc., were being used for the investment of surplus finance capital. Imperialism had evolved as the final stage of capitalist development. Beyond Imperialism it could not go. There can be no 'ultra- or supra-Imperialism,' a theory fathered by the German social-democratic theoretician, Karl Kautsky.

The truth of Lenin's analysis has been amply demonstrated by the latest development of monopoly-capitalism in Germany and Italy, where vested interests threw off the mask of parliamentary government and set up openly terroristic fascist dictatorships.² By this means they hoped to arrest the forward march of social progress and prevent the transition from monopoly-capitalism or Imperialism to Socialism. Fascism is the counter-revolution of the bourgeoisie, established in anticipation of the Social Revolution. It is not, as has been asserted in some quarters, another stage in the development of capitalism. This theory was given the lie by the breakdown of the Fascist régime in Italy under the impact of the present war. The facts revealed that the monopoly-capitalists and large agrarians were the power who pulled the strings behind the seemingly unseatable dictator, Mussolini.

Imperialism, in either its 'Democratic' or Fascist form means oppression and the subjugation of hundreds of millions of people of different nationalities throughout the world. Opposition to it, Lenin emphasised, must, therefore, be organised on an international scale, but where the imperialist chain was weakest, there it would break first. Czarist Imperialism was regarded by Lenin as so corrupt and decaying that of all the Imperialisms it was the most rotten. Therefore he was certain, the international imperialist chain would break first. Thus, the National and Colonial Question, of capital importance as a tactical issue, was equally important.

¹ J. A. Hobson: *Imperialism*.

² In Japan, parliamentary government, while still formally in existence, has been subordinated to a military junta carrying out the foreign policy of monopoly-capitalists.

as a basic fundamental. The strengthening of the nationalist aspirations of the component parts of the Empire strategically undermines the imperial foundations. The open and successful revolt of the colonial countries against the imperial country decides its break-up. The metropolitan masses and the masses of the colonial countries have, therefore, an identical objective which indissolubly links their fate: the overthrow of the common imperialist oppressor.

Such were the strategic deductions arrived at by Lenin, and alone among the contemporary Russian Left-wing parties, the Russian Social Democratic Party (Bolsheviks) concerned themselves with the Colonial and National Question as it operated on the international arena, and it was precisely in connection with this problem that Lenin's statesmanship was to be proved so correct. All the other parties, the Cadets (Liberals), the Mensheviks (Minority Social Democrats), the Social Revolutionaries (primarily a peasants' party: led by Kerensky), were bankrupt as far as the Colonial Question was concerned.

Among the Bolsheviks there was an ex-theological student from Georgia, Joseph Vissarionovitch Djughashvili, now known to the world as Joseph Stalin and the second leader of the Soviet Union. He was entrusted by Lenin with the task of clarifying the party's attitude on the National and Colonial Question in its propaganda, and it was not accidental that he became its leading theoretician on the problem of subject nationalities. Himself a native of a colonial area, unlike most of the leaders of the October Revolution, he had first-hand knowledge of imperialist oppression as it was practised upon an 'inferior' race. In 1913, Stalin amplified Lenin's theories in his pamphlet, *Marxism and the National Question*, first published in Vienna. This became the party's official handbook or 'guide to action,' laying down the principles of strategy to be adopted in solving the National and Colonial Question. Stalin laid the basis of his theoretical reputation with this document, which enunciated and amplified the following Leninist thesis:

- (a) The world is divided into two camps: the camp of a handful of civilised nations which possess finance capital and exploit the vast majority of the population of the globe, and the camp of the oppressed and

- exploited peoples of the colonies and dependent countries that comprise the majority;
- (b) The colonies and the dependent countries, oppressed and exploited by finance capital, constitute an enormous reserve power and a most important source of strength for imperialism;
 - (c) The revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples in the dependent and colonial countries against imperialism is the only road that leads to their emancipation from oppression and exploitation;
 - (d) The principal colonial and dependent countries have already entered on the path of the national liberation movement which is bound to bring about a crisis in world capitalism;
 - (e) The interests of the proletarian movement in the advanced countries and of the national liberation movement in the colonies require the fusion of these two aspects of the revolutionary movement into a common front against the common enemy, imperialism;
 - (f) The victory of the working class in the developed countries and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible without the formation and the consolidation of the common revolutionary front;
 - (g) The formation of the common revolutionary front is impossible unless the proletariat of the oppressor nation renders direct and determined support to the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples against the imperialism of 'its own country' for 'no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations';
 - (h) This support implies the advocacy, defence and realisation of the slogan of the right of nations to secession and to independent political existence;
 - (i) Unless this slogan is put into effect, the amalgamation and collaboration of nations which constitutes the material basis for the victory of socialism, will be impossible;
 - (j) This amalgamation can only be a voluntary one and must be based on mutual confidence and fraternal relations between the nations.¹

¹ Joseph Stalin: *Marxism and the National Question*, pp. 195-196.

The wisdom of Lenin's uncompromising defence of the Right of Self-Determination for the subject nations of the Russian Empire is to be seen today in the enthusiastic support of the erstwhile Colonial peoples of Russia in defence of the Soviet system, which is all the more striking when we compare it with the apathy, disinterestedness and open hostility of large sections of the coloured subject races of Malaya, Burma, the Dutch East Indies, India, Africa, and elsewhere.¹ Only in the Philippines, where the Americans promised independence in 1946, did the natives offer heroic resistance to the Japanese invaders.

It must be stated, however, that the sincere and wise stand of Lenin did not find wholehearted support among all his associates at the time when the principle was first formulated. Many of them doubted the wisdom of giving so much attention to the National Question. Are we not internationalists? they asked, and are we not definitely fighting against national privileges and against nationalism of any kind? They maintained that since they were fighting for the class interests of the proletariat they could, therefore, have nothing to do with the National Question. But Lenin has proved, and history has confirmed, that these people were absolutely wrong.

It is quite true, as that brilliant revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg warned, that the landlord and capitalist section of the oppressed nations might exploit the Right of Self-Determination to impose their own class domination upon the masses of their own nation. She foresaw this particularly in the case of Poland, her own country, and her forecast here proved unfortunately correct, as also in Finland.

How Finland Got Her Independence.

Before the October Revolution Finland was a Russian colony, which had been granted a fairly democratic constitution in 1907 as a result of the abortive revolution of 1905, but the Imperial Power reserved the right of veto. Even with these limitations Finland was the most politically advanced section of the Czarist Empire.

The February Revolution provided the opportunity for

¹ For a full account of the attitude of the coloured races consult: *Hell in the Sunshine* by Cedric Dover (Secker & Warburg).

the Finns to demand the withdrawal of the Governor-Generalship and the establishment of full independence. The so-called socialist Kerensky opposed this measure and suppressed the Finnish Diet or Parliament with the aid of Russian troops.

With the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in November 1917, Lenin immediately recognised Finland's Right to Self-Determination, even to the point of secession. On December 31, 1917, the Soviet Government issued a decree formally acknowledging this independence. The Finnish workers and peasants then set up their own Socialistic administration in Helsingfors. At this point there came upon the scene an ex-Czarist officer of Finnish birth who had not previously identified himself with the struggle for his country's independence, but on the contrary had shown himself a personal supporter of the Czarist autocracy. Baron General Mannerheim placed himself at the head of a counter-revolutionary 'White' government of Finnish capitalists and landlords which had organised itself at Vaasa in the north. With the aid of German troops under Von der Goltz, who landed an army at Hango under instructions from the Kaiser, these reactionary Finnish nationalists put down the workers' and peasants' government. "Out of 80,000 Red prisoners," wrote *The Times*, "more than 30,000 are dead."¹

The Left-wing Helsingfors Government was defeated and its leaders forced to flee. A most brutal massacre was inflicted upon the workers and peasants, and the Right-wing régime then set up under the ægis of Baron Mannerheim has ever since made Finland a jumping-off ground for attack against the Soviet Union and the vassal of the different Imperialist Powers (Britain and France in 1940; Germany in 1941) seeking to intervene against the first Socialist State.

The power of the Finnish workers had proved inadequate to resist the counter-revolution, aided as it was by outside interventionists. For their part the masses had lacked the assistance of the Russian proletariat. Why was this? It was because the Russian workers and peasants were themselves dangerously hard pressed to maintain their power against their own counter-revolutionaries and foreign forces, and found it impossible without threat to the whole Revolution to

¹ Reported in *The Times* of Feb. 11, 1919.

send reinforcement to help the Finnish workers and peasants against *their* landlords and capitalists and their German supporters.

The Finnish workers failed to consolidate their Social Revolution. But did this prove Lenin wrong in supporting Self-Determination for Finland? Absolutely no. As a result of their suppression over centuries, first by the Swedes and then by the Russians, the Finnish people, irrespective of class—workers and capitalists, peasants and landlords—were imbued with an intense desire for political independence of all foreign rule. Should the Bolsheviks have obstructed the realisation of this national aspiration? Should Lenin have behaved like Kerensky and not only refused to recognise the claims of the Finns, but have sent the Red Army to take away even those limited democratic rights which they had achieved under the Czar? What difference in this respect had there been between the earlier Provisional Government and the Czarist autocracy? None, as we have seen.

Most assuredly the Soviet Government would have irretrievably compromised itself had it adopted towards the Finns the same attitude as the Kerensky Government. Any action of the kind on the part of the Soviet Government would have forfeited the sympathy of the oppressed peoples of the Czarist Empire in general. Quite clearly the issue would have been raised: What is the difference between Lenin and Kerensky? What difference between the Soviets and the Czardom? They would have concluded—and rightly—that Russians are all the same, no matter what political faith they profess; that they are all imperialist suppressors of the rights of small nations. We heard this accusation made even by British Left-wing parties at the time when the Red Army marched into the Baltic to keep Hitler out in 1939 and again during the Finnish War of 1940 undertaken to safeguard the approaches to Leningrad.

Lenin's Policy Proves Itself.

Fundamentally Lenin was right, as we can now see more clearly, despite the fact that the Finnish capitalists prostituted themselves to the extent of permitting their country to be used for reactionary purposes by foreign imperialists until it had been brought to a desperate plight as the satellite of the

Nazis. Certainly it is not the Soviets which have been discredited, except before ignorant people, but such ardent anti-democrats as Tanner, who allowed himself to be made the tool of Finnish reaction and German Fascism.

It was unfortunate that the situation in 1918 caught the Russian Soviet power in a position too weak to render that fraternal help and assistance to the even weaker Finnish Socialist Government which, under more favourable circumstances, would have led to the fraternal union of the Finnish Soviet Republic with the greater union which came into being round the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

Certainly Lenin expounded that socialists of the oppressed nations must unequivocally fight for the complete unity of the toiling masses of the oppressed and oppressing nationalities, which implies also organisational unity. Yet it must be borne carefully in mind that the age-long oppression of the colonial and subject nationalities by Imperialist Powers has aroused a feeling of bitterness among the masses of the enslaved nations. There is as well a feeling of distrust towards the proletariat of those Powers, since they have not demonstrated any variance with the attitude of their ruling classes. British imperial history affords the best example of this disposition in the attitude of the Irish people. Only a hypocrite will deny that the Irish have a hatred of the English which extends even to the working class.

This same feeling of distrust is as strong among the masses of Africans, Indians, Burmans and other subject peoples of the British Empire. Accordingly, these colonial masses will not be won to the side of the British working class until they become convinced that the English Left is fighting against every form of racial discrimination, exploitation and oppression, and for the Right of Self-Determination for colonial peoples without regard to their stage of cultural and social progress.

Even where political and economic domination no longer exist, it takes time to remove the legacy of distrust which century-old oppressor-oppressed relations leave behind. This psychological distrust of 'Russians' is an important factor in present-day Soviet-Polish relations, and it is being exploited by reactionary nationalistic Polish landlords and militarists to

prevent the Polish masses establishing firm and lasting friendship with the Soviet peoples.

The Baltic States Secede.

The Soviet Union lost the western sections of the Czarist Empire because Lenin's insistence upon the principle of Self-Determination had led to the suppression of the working classes of Finland and the Baltic lands by their native capitalists and landlords. This loss was more than counter-balanced by the support of the peoples of the Asiatic sections of the Empire, and of the Caucasus, who were won for the Revolution by the sincere and determined stand which the Bolsheviks had taken, even to the point of recognising the secessionist governments of the Baltic provinces.

Inspired by the November events, the workers in the Baltic provinces of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, who had close fraternal contact with the Russian workers, asserted their Right of Self-Determination and set up Soviets. However, the Provisional Governments formed by the native capitalists and landlords called in the aid of German troops and suppressed the workers' Soviets. After the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, these 'patriots' appealed to the Kaiser to establish a protectorate over the Baltic states under a Prussian king.

On the downfall of the Hohenzollern régime in 1918, the White Guard General Yudenich occupied Estonia, and with the aid of the local gentry set up a so-called North Western Government. It was from Estonia that the counter-revolutionaries then advanced upon Leningrad. They were, however, beaten back by the Red Army and armed workers under the leadership of Trotsky. Although Lenin would have been justified after this treachery in sending the Red Army into Estonia, in order that by occupying it further use could not have been made of it as a starting point for other attacks upon the Soviets, he refused to countenance such a move. Instead, the Soviet Government signed a peace treaty with Estonia on February 2, 1920. A similar treaty was concluded with Lithuania on July 20, 1920, and with Latvia on August 11, 1920.

This is how the Baltic States became independent. No sooner, however, had they obtained Soviet recognition than,

like Finland and Poland, they prostituted themselves to the Western Imperialist Powers and began to scheme against the Soviet Union. Until the rise of Fascism in Germany, the Baltic States and Poland constituted a sort of military outpost of Western Imperialism in Eastern Europe: the *cordon sanitaire* of Clemenceau and Lloyd George against Bolshevism. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, the Baltic 'patriots,' whose capitalist governments, incidentally, the Anglo-American Governments still recognise, joined the Nazis. They hoped that Hitler would restore the economic and political power which they lost when these territories were incorporated into the Soviet Union in July 1940. Stalin has made it quite clear in his Order of the Day to the Red Army on its 24th anniversary that these Baltic territories will remain integral parts of the U.S.S.R. The role of these Baltic 'client' states as eastern outposts for Western Imperialist Powers is over. The former ruling classes will now have to find more useful occupations.

Role of the Native Bourgeoisie

There is, of course, another side to this question of Self-Determination. Before colonial countries were subjected to imperialist domination they had existed as independent political or social units. National existence among them had, perforce, achieved varying stages of maturity, due to the law of the uneven development of capitalism. Imperialism, however, arrested the growth of the productive forces and fostered a sense of frustration. This in turn intensified the urge to move forward nationally, and created thereby a common bond between all sections of the repressed nation—the landlords, the middle classes and the toiling masses. This psychological inversion forms the essence of bourgeois nationalism. Undisputedly, in such historic circumstances, the native bourgeoisie is the most conscious section of the subject nation and invariably places itself in the forefront of the national liberation movement with intent to use the support of the workers, and more especially the peasants, in furthering its particular class aspirations. The chief interest of the bourgeoisie of a subject nation is to free itself from the foreign domination so that, in turn, it may itself usurp the state power and impose its will upon its own masses. This

phenomenon was expressed not only among the exploited nations of the Czarist and Austro-Hungarian Empires, but can be seen today in China and India, where the capitalists and landlords who support the anti-imperialist struggle against Japan on the one hand and Britain on the other, are fighting for independence not in order to introduce a socialist system, but to break the fetters which foreign Imperialism has locked upon their industrial and economic development.

Despite the limited social outlook of the native bourgeoisie, however, such a struggle is historically progressive, especially in the present epoch of imperialist wars and revolutions, and must be supported. This applies even where a semi-independent country like China, for military reasons, finds itself on the side of one coalition of Imperialist Powers against another. It is not the military alliance that determines our attitude but the political aims of the struggle of the colonial or semi-colonial country concerned. For war, as Clausewitz has emphasised, is merely the means of attaining political objectives.¹ Therefore, it is always necessary to ask: What is the war about? What class is conducting it? And what are its aims? The aim of the Chinese people is to prevent Japan today—other Imperialist Powers tomorrow—from reducing them to the colonial status of Indians and Africans, and from exploiting their labour and natural resources in the interests of monopoly finance-capital. China is therefore fighting a socially progressive war, while Japan is carrying out a reactionary role in the war. A Chinese victory will not only deliver a stinging blow to Japanese Imperialism but to all Imperialisms in Asia. This must in turn influence the national liberation movements of the subject peoples throughout Asia.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the Chinese are even fighting for the social emancipation of the Japanese people. For only the military defeat of Japan by China can open the way for the Social Revolution in Japan.

The defeat of Czarist militarism in 1905 prepared the way for the victory of the Social Revolution of 1917. Lenin benefited from the experiences of the abortive revolution.

¹ "War is not merely a political act, but also a real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means"—Von Clausewitz: "On War," Vol. 1, p. 23.

That is why he described 1905 as the 'dress rehearsal' for October, which ushered in the Soviet régime and emancipated not only the workers and peasants of Russia proper, but also the millions of exploited people in the colonial territories of the Czarist Empire. And it was the teeming millions of Asiatic Russia who supported the Bolsheviks in the struggle against the counter-revolution and foreign intervention. For with the granting of the Right of Self-Determination and the concession of voluntary separation by the formerly imperialist country, the national bourgeoisie is deprived of the demagogic platform by which it binds the masses to itself. Once the subject country is freed from the foreign yoke with the voluntary consent of the formerly dominant nation, the native capitalists and landlords are exposed as the substitutes of the foreign overlord. As long as Czarism ruled, the native bourgeoisies of the subject and oppressed nations were able to pose as the defenders of the national aspirations. Once the Bolsheviks had declared the subject nations' Right to Self-Determination, this, their sole prop, was gone. "For communism knows that the amalgamation of the nations into a single world economic system is possible only on the basis of mutual confidence and voluntary agreement; that the formation of a voluntary amalgamation of nations must be preceded by the separation of the colonies from the 'integral' imperialist 'whole,' by the transformation of the colonies into independent States."¹

¹ Joseph Stalin : *Marxism and the National Question*, p. 197.

PART II

THE NEW RUSSIA

CHAPTER FOUR

HOW THE CZARIST COLONIAL EMPIRE WAS
LIBERATED

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION was the opportunity and Lenin and his party were *the agents* who used the opportunity to implement the principle of Self-Determination for the subject peoples of the Russian Empire, even to the point of voluntary separation, if desired. Lenin had consistently stressed that without theory there can be no revolutionary practice, and here the Bolsheviks had theory ready for immediate application. The historic moment did not find them wanting. The liquidation of the Czarist Colonial Empire was not accidental, but a deliberate policy of socialist strategy and objective.

Indeed, the more one studies Lenin's interpretation of Marxism and the invaluable original contributions which he brought to revolutionary theory, the more one becomes convinced of the outstanding greatness of the man, of the uniqueness of his mind and personality. Nowhere among Socialist movements of Western Europe has there been thrown up such a theoretical and revolutionary giant. Certainly not in England, where the intellectual class has tended to regard theory with contempt and scorn. That is why the British Labour Movement has grown up in such shapeless form. It reflects the intellectual outlook of its ruling class, which shies away from theory as though it were a deathly contagious disease. Hence the ineffectuality of the British Labour Movement, for without theory practice has nothing to guide it.

The Bolshevik Party, having a clear conception of its goal, was able, four days after the capture of power, to issue on