

SOCIALISM UNITES—IMPERIALISM DIVIDES

CHAPTER EIGHT

SELF-DETERMINATION OR SUBJECTION?

In the preceding sections we have surveyed the rise and fall of the Czarist Empire and described the transformation of that vast imperial structure into a new kind of State—a Multi-National Federated Socialist Commonwealth based on the common ownership of the means of production and distribution and a planned economy. We have in the course of our survey traced the tremendous political, economic and social changes which have taken place in the territories which, just over a quarter of a century ago, formed the Asiatic colonies of the now defunct Czarist Empire. There is no doubt that the peoples of those erstwhile colonies have undergone the most radical transformation recorded by history in such a short space of time.

There is only one other political aggregate in the world today which includes such a heterogeneous multitude of peoples as the Soviet Union. That is the British Empire, which is made up of the white Dominions, forming, together with the United Kingdom, the British Commonwealth of Nations; and the dependent coloured Empire, composed of India, Burma, Africa, and a number of territories scattered throughout the world, variously described as Crown Colonies, Protectorates, Mandates, Condominiums. The white population is 70,000,000, and the coloured over 500,000,000.

In the light of the experiences attending the war we may well profit from a comparative examination of the attitude of the non-European or coloured peoples of the U.S.S.R., and those of the British Colonial and Indian Empires. This comparison provides the most definite illustration of the fundamental difference between the non-Imperialist Soviet and the

Imperialist British systems. Here we are not concerned with the white self-governing Dominions of the Commonwealth,¹ but with those parts of the dependent Empire—India, Burma, Malaya, Africa, etc.—inhabited largely by coloured races. For the acid test of the stability of any multi-racial and multi-national political structure is the spontaneous loyalty and enthusiasm demonstrated by the diverse ethnic elements constituting that political system in times of crisis. What does the application of this test reveal?

It reveals, on the one hand, the U.S.S.R., a union of peoples at varying stages of social and cultural development, of many races and colours, forming a monolithic phalanx before the enemy, inspired by an enthusiastic fanaticism which evoked the admiration of friend and foe alike. These comrades-in-arms, these European Slavs—Great Russians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians—and Asiatics—Georgians and Azerbaijanians, Turkmans and Tajiks, Kazaks and Kalmuks, Bashkirs and Tartars, Buriat-Mongols, and other descendants of Jenghis Khan's hordes, have fought tenaciously to preserve that way of life which, despite many shortcomings, gives them so much hope of a happy future.

"The German-Fascists stupidly expected that the Soviet Union would fall apart at the first onslaught," writes a leading Soviet authority on the National Question. "Not a single Soviet Republic withdrew from the Union, not one of them so much as thought of taking advantage of its right freely to secede from the Union. Far from it—in the years of war the moral and political unity of the Soviet people has become so firm that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., in its session of February, 1944, found it possible to extend the sovereign rights of the Union Republics, and to grant them the right to have their own military formations, and enter into direct relations with foreign States."²

It was not the German-Fascists alone who expected the Soviet State structure to disintegrate under the impact of war. There was a large section of opinion in Britain which held

¹ According to the Government of External Relations Act, Eire is a sovereign independent State, associated for certain purposes with the British Commonwealth of Nations.

² *Soviet War News*, June 28, 1944. Article entitled "Force and Vitality of Soviet National Policy," by V. Karpinsky.

this same view, and its standpoint was given expression by the leading Right-wing publicist, Frederick A. Voigt, editor of the influential journal, *The Nineteenth Century and After*, who predicted uprisings from among the Ukrainians and Georgians, who "have suffered under the Muscovite despotism."¹

How chagrined these reactionary anti-Soviet elements must have felt to witness how solidly the Soviet Union held together as against the contrasting development in East Asia, where events have graphically exposed the inherent weakness of the Colonial structures—British, Dutch, French, etc. According to the Singapore Correspondent of that venerable organ of British Imperialism, *The Times*, "After nearly 120 years of British rule the vast majority of the Asiatics were not sufficiently interested in the continuance of this rule to take any steps to ensure its continuance."² What a damning indictment of British Colonial administration!

Why is it that these Asiatic peoples—Malayans and Burmese—after enjoying more than a century of British rule, with its culture, 'trusteeship,' and the rest, display such ingratitude for the gifts which the British imperialists have brought them that they desert their 'trustees' and 'benefactors' just at the time when they are most in need of support? The answer to this question is to be found in the economic and social conditions prevailing in those Colonial countries at the time of the Japanese invasion, which it will do no harm to review.

1. Malaya.

Malaya represented the wealthiest unit of the British Empire. With 50 per cent of the world's tin and 70 per cent of the world's rubber, it was a veritable Eldorado for predatory capitalism; it was the dream of the City of London come true. The alien conquerer came into this rich land and took possession of most of the wealth after "a long, a harassing, and expensive war which was only brought to a conclusion by hunting the rebels out of Pahang, and even

¹ *The Nineteenth Century and After*, August 1941.

² This sentence was omitted from the dispatch as published in *The Times*, but was printed in *The Manchester Guardian* (18 2 1942), for which paper the same Correspondent reported.

following them into the independent neighbouring states."¹ The conqueror did not even give the Malayans the Bible in return for their lands, for they remained Mohammedans. The nabobs, having taken possession of the best areas of the country, turned to India, whence they brought indentured labour into Malaya to develop their lands and mines. This they did because foreign coolie labour was even cheaper than the indigenous kind, the Malayans having showed no desire to work for the Europeans at the prevailing wages paid for labour in the tin mines and on the rubber plantations. Those people who believe that Imperialism is a philanthropic institution creating jobs for backward races need not look farther than Malaya to see how wrong they are.

The pukka sahibs were in Malaya to line their pockets. These 'birds of passage' were feathering their nests as fast as they possibly could. Even now they hope to return and develop resources at the point where they were forced to leave the Japanese in charge. That is the reason why, while they duly admired at a great distance the scorched earth policy operated in the Soviet Union, they left things in order for Japanese interim control. They look forward to a speedy return and a renewal of the 'good old times.' And when that time comes, "we must regard our imperial heritage as our responsibility in the investment of our surplus cash,"² the Tory M.P., Captain Gammans, exhorts the old gang.

Wages in Malaya averaged one shilling to 1s. 6d. a day for men and eightpence to ninepence for women. These were the ruling rates in factories, mines and on plantations, and the legal maximum working day was fixed at nine hours. During December 1940, workers on an estate of the Dunlop Rubber Company demanded higher wages and went on strike when they were refused. Three strikers were shot and others wounded when military forces were called in to quell the workers. At Selangor during May 1941, seven thousand workers went on strike, and five of them were killed in the clashes with the police which followed.

These labour disturbances were ascribed to "subversive propaganda," questions in Parliament drawing the reply that

¹ *British Malaya*, by Governor Swettenham, p. 271.

² *Singapore Sequel*, by Capt. L. D. Gammans. Signpost Booklets.

there was no economic justification for them. Members of Parliament may, of course, consider one shilling to 1s. 6d. a day sufficient wages for colonials. At any rate, these were the wages which caused the strikes, and the fact that the trade union law forbade peaceful picketing gave an excuse for the official attacks upon the workers. At the same time extremely handsome profits were being pocketed by the rubber companies.

Not even the semblance of political or industrial democracy was enjoyed by the indigenous people. "The Societies Ordinance makes political organisations illegal, and prior to 1940 also made trade unions illegal. Now, as the result of tremendous labour unrest, trade unions are legalised under the Trade Union Enactment in the Straits Settlements but this enactment seeks merely to bring the unions under the control of the Governor, and it makes all trade union activities—strikes, political activities, etc., illegal. The Official Secrets Enactment and the Seditious Ordinance give the Governor tremendously wide and vague powers. Under these ordinances persons can be convicted not only for actions but for 'seditious tendencies' and 'purposes detrimental to the interests of the British Empire.'

"The freedom of the press, of publication, of the importation of books, of the showing of films, of meetings, etc., are all severely restricted. In all the Malay States freedom of conscience is infringed by the power of the sultans to compel attendance at the mosques and to declare 'false doctrines' illegal. Everywhere police services are highly developed, particularly political police. Judges are usually colonial service officials. Deportation without trial is very frequent."

One of the moral justifications of Imperialism, used particularly by the British, is that European occupation of backward territories will abolish slavery and kindred practices incompatible with modern standards of civilisation. Child slavery, however, flourished in Hong Kong and the Malay States. Known as *Mui Tsai*, it fed on the grinding poverty of the people, who were only too glad to receive a few dollars in exchange for the children they could not afford to feed and clothe. The girls, from the very youngest age (even

¹ *Civil Liberty*—Journal of the National Council for Civil Liberties. March, 1941.

under three years), were as a rule sold into domestic slavery and very often passed over into brothels. Boys were bought to work in factories and for other kinds of labour.

When he was Secretary of State for Colonies in 1922, Mr. Winston Churchill told Parliament that he desired "to make it clear that both the Governor (of Hong Kong, the distributing centre) and I are determined to effect the abolition of the system at the earliest practicable date, and I have indicated to the Governor that I expect the change to be carried out within a year."

That expectation was too optimistic, for Lady Simon, writing in 1929, told that the system still flourished in Hong Kong,¹ and on May 29, 1941, Mr. Creech Jones, M.P., asked the Under-Secretary of State for Colonies "whether steps are being taken by legislative action in the Straits Settlements to prohibit the traffic in boys, who are sold for employment in factories and industries outside the territories, for domestic service and for training in circuses and theatres?"² Replying to this question, Labour's representative, Mr. George Hall, then Colonial Under-Secretary, completely evaded it and talked some drivel about there being a traffic of some extent in boys from China ports to Malaya since the extension of hostilities in the Sino-Japanese conflict.

The Secretary of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, which for some time had concerned itself with this question of *Mui Tsai*, addressed a communication to the Colonial Office on June 17, 1941, in which attention was invited "to the statement, in the report of the Governor of the Straits Settlements on the *Mui Tsai* System for the second half of 1939 (Ref. S.C.A. 1003 1939), that there is no legislation in the Straits Settlements to prevent the traffic in boys. The fact is recorded without comment, without any suggestion of its being a hitherto undiscovered omission in the law of the Colony, and without any indication of any intention to remedy the law."³

According to Mr. Hall's reply to Mr. Creech Jones, of the 29th May, 1941, the Governor of the Straits Settlements had decided to take steps to prevent the traffic, but unfor-

¹ Lady Simon: *Slavery*, see pp. 96-114.

² *Hansard*, May 29, 1941.

³ *Anti-Slavery Report*, October, 1941.

unately for the victims history does not wait upon the leisurely reforms of pro-consuls. For over a hundred years Britain had been in Malaya and she had failed to eradicate the evil which has been one of her avowed reasons for taking up the burden of imperial rule. Now the Japanese have taken the situation into their hands, and it is too much to hope that these perpetrators of horrible outrages in Hong Kong will play the role of social reformers in Malaya.¹

2. Singapore.

And what was it like in Singapore? At the Singapore headquarters of the British administration, the Governor, the representative of the Imperial Power, combined in his person the office of High Commissioner, with control over the sultans of the Federated and Unfederated States, who governed the native subjects in those territories. The system of Indirect Rule was the only contact between the imperial 'trustees' and 'their native 'wards.' Unfortunately the 'wards' did not recognise any benefits from the 'trustees.'

The Legislative Council of Singapore, the Crown Colony area, was composed of 13 officials, heads of the various civil and military departments, and 11 members hand-picked by the Governor. Only two members were elected, and they represented the European Chambers of Commerce of Singapore and Penang. The Singapore natives, like those of the mainland, had no voice in their own affairs. Surely it is not really surprising that when the crisis came the Governor, Sir Shenton Thomas, was unable to mobilise the common people—Malayans, Chinese, Indians—to withstand the Japanese onslaught? How could a people whose existence had been entirely ignored, presumably because they were considered unfit to participate in the government of the country, suddenly resuscitate themselves as it were and assume responsibility in defence of the system which had until then failed to recognise their existence?

These Colonial people, exploited, oppressed, victims of colour bar practices and theocracy, subjected to the racial arrogance of the ruling *Herrenvolk*, recognised only the enemy

¹ The best detailed study on the subject is *Child Slavery in Hong Kong*, by Lieut. Comdr. and Mrs. H. L. Haslewood. The Sheldon Press.

already entrenched in their land. For while Colonial intellectuals and Socialists have no illusions about Japanese Imperialism, which, despite its demagogic appeal of 'Asia for the Asiatics,' is equally as predatory and brutal as Western Imperialism, it cannot be expected that illiterate native masses should be able to make this differentiation. They have a feeling of *omni ignatum pro magnifico*: the untried master is the best. The word 'Briton' to the native Colonial peoples, like the word 'Russian' to the former subject peoples of Czarism, is synonymous with 'oppressor.'

"The British had no roots in the people," asserted the *Times* Correspondent. But why, we ask, did they have no roots in the people after a hundred years? Because an Imperialist Power can have no roots in a subject people except the roots of bayonets. The very nature of Imperialism is a negation of fraternal relations between peoples. Its only relationship with the subject peoples can be that of the rider to the horse: the one on the back of the other. And he who carries the White Man's Burden has to have a strong back.

Describing the status of the white overlords in Malaya, a distinguished authority on the Far East says: "The functions of the white man in a colony are limited to ruling, owning and managing. Any other form of occupation is degrading and damaging to the white prestige on which the whole system rests . . . Even national lines, so bitterly held at home, have a way of softening down as against the overwhelming numbers of the coloured races; all who are of the white race are Europeans and stand potentially together in the face of the enemy, who is being ruled and exploited."¹

Tired of carrying this burden, the masses of the coloured population of Singapore showed no enthusiasm when the Japanese attacked the island fortress. "With the exception of certain sections of the Chinese community—some inspired by Free China's struggle for survival, others by Soviet precept and example—the bulk of the Asiatic population remained spectators from start to finish. Their inclination was to get as far as possible from the scene of hostilities. In Singapore this caused acute difficulties in the field of labour. . . . There was no native labour at the docks. Soldiers had to be taken away from military duties to load and unload ships."¹

¹ *The Times*, February 18, 1942.

Being politically educated, the people of Britain may argue and debate the ideological character of the war: Whether it is an inter-imperialist conflict; whether it is a struggle between Fascism and Democracy, or just Good against Evil. To the natives of Malaya—whom their British rulers describe as 'backward' and, therefore, as unfit to enjoy the benefits of democracy—it was simply a fight between two bands of marauders who were overrunning their country; a fight in which they were not concerned except as the prize. Their attitude was 'a plague on both camps.'

And when all is said and done, what example did the 20,000 Europeans set for them? While the fate of their Empire was being decided on the Malayan peninsula, the pukka sahibs in Singapore were having a good time, declared Lady Brooke-Popham, wife of the Commander-in-Chief, on her return to England. "The majority of the civilians," she asserted, "were immersed in a long round of tennis and dancing. I tried to wake them up, but it was hopeless. . . . They were too busy with their social engagements." They were so obsessed with white prestige and their own importance that even Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's offer to send crack Chinese forces to Singapore to help defend the fortress was declined. The Japanese overran the whole peninsula in nine weeks!

In a handbook published about the time of the fall of Singapore, inspired by the Colonial Office and entitled *The British Colonial Empire*, the author assured us that "The wealth of Malaya . . . is laid on secure foundations, and its future, under British administration and protection, is equally secure. . . . Malaya is today a contented and peaceful country, and one of the most successful examples of British colonial administration."¹ How these official apologists misled the British people, and how history has given them the lie!

But taking everything as a whole, the pukka sahibs have no legitimate reason for complaint. For over a century they had been living on the fat of the land. Three British tin mining companies, Tronoh Mines, Southern Tronoh Mines

¹ *The British Colonial Empire*, p. 125. By W. E. Simnett, a former editor of *Crown Colonist*, official organ of the Crown Agents for the Colonies.

and Sungei Besi Mines published profits in 1942 of phenomenal size.

"Tronoh, with a capital of £300,000, made a net profit after taxation, etc., of £169,196, and paid a dividend of 55 per cent, the profits being well over half of the capital. Southern Tronoh, with a capital of £200,000, made profits on the same basis of £69,762 and paid 30 per cent. Sungei Besi, with a capital of only £144,000, made no less than £95,731 and paid 58.1/3 per cent dividend, the profits being two-thirds of the capital. The colossal profits from these and similar undertakings will now be flowing into Japanese coffers instead of back to London. Those are the stakes for which Britain fights!"¹

The pukka sahibs would not even pay taxes for the defence of their properties. A war-time bill re-introducing income tax²—which had ceased in 1922—was passed in February 1941. The tax ranged from 2 per cent up to a maximum of 8 per cent on incomes over £3,400. The re-introduction of this war emergency tax almost caused a revolution among the 'patriots.' Assuredly, Sir Shenton Thomas could have had no easy time with those "whisky drinking rubber planters and tin miners."

It was the Chinese and Malaysians who paid for the upkeep of Singapore, from revenue derived largely from the Government opium monopoly. Out of the taxes squeezed from the Malayan peasants the sultans contributed over £20,000,000 toward imperial defence between the two world wars.² And when the enemy struck the natives were left defenceless. Most of the European planters and mine owners were evacuated with their families.

Burma.

Even before the war in the Pacific broke out, the Burmese people made their attitude to Britain plainly known through U Saw, at the time Prime Minister of the Colony. His claim for Dominion status for the 17-million natives of Burma was categorically rejected by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India and Burma, when U Saw visited

¹ Don Bateman, *The New Leader*, January 31, 1942.

² See John Gunther: *Inside Asia*, Ch. 19, in which he described how the trade in opium helped to pay for Singapore's defence.

London in November 1941. "Burma," declared U Saw, was brought into the war by an edict of the Governor. The elected representatives of the people were not consulted. . . . Burmese people were convinced that they were fighting for their freedom as well as for that of the rest of the world, and there can be no question about it—Burma's war effort could be increased fourfold." He made it quite obvious that "There is a small section of Burmese opinion which believes that to aid Britain in the war means to aid Britain to keep us in subjection. . . . There is another section, which, while it cherishes no love for the Japanese, feels that if it is Burma's destiny to remain a subject nation, then it might prefer to be governed by a nation that is of the same blood and of the same religion." U Saw is now held somewhere as a potential enemy of Britain's imperial interests.

U Saw himself did not enjoy any mass backing in Burma. He was a reactionary nationalist, the son of a feudal landowner whom the British officials made use of to combat the growing agrarian movement headed by Dr. Ba Maw, the former Prime Minister and leader of the Sinyetha (or Poor Man) Party. Dr. Ba Maw was arrested and sent to prison in 1940 for making anti-British speeches. U Saw formed his own party, the Myochit (or Patriot) Party in September 1940, and was made Prime Minister. He was subsequently accused of treachery to his masters and for making contact with the Japanese after Pearl Harbour. As in Malaya, so in Burma the British authorities were completely isolated from the native masses. With the progressive leaders in gaol and U Saw under arrest, their last link was severed.

As a result of this isolation the Japanese, on invading Burma, instead of being met by a hostile population, were joined by 'Free Burmans,' organised by the extremist national associations, chief of which was the Thakin Movement.

Imperialism is incapable of saving itself from the trap which it creates of its own volition. British Imperialism is incapable of offering freedom to its subject peoples, the only means by which it can secure their unswerving loyalty and enthusiastic support. To do so would be to commit *hara-kiri*. "The Colonial Empire is essential to our economic

well-being," observes Captain Gammans, "else we become a small island on the fringe of Europe unable to defend ourselves or to feed ourselves. Without our overseas dependencies we should become like Austria after the last war."

4. *Postscript on Burma.*

Like the Bourbons, the British Tories learn nothing and forget nothing. Thus, no sooner had the Japanese evacuated Rangoon, the capital of Burma, than the Tory Secretary of State, Mr. Amery, issued an official statement in the form of a White Paper setting forth the Government's proposals for the future of Burma.

As soon as the military hand over the capital to the civil authorities, the Governor, Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith, will exercise complete autocratic powers "until conditions permit" the country to return to the *status quo ante*.

It is proposed that when the 1935 Constitution (suspended in 1942) is restored, a government formed from an elected Legislature, controlling matters excluding finance, defence and foreign affairs, will be set up. And from this political level Burma will gradually proceed along the slippery constitutional road to "full self-government within the British Commonwealth", arriving at that goal at some unspecified time. This, in brief, is the political blank-cheque offered 17 million Burmese.

Considering the fact that the Burmese enjoyed a much greater measure of self-government during the Japanese occupation than they even had before the invasion, it is very unlikely that the political parties and organisations associated with the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League will cooperate with the Governor in carrying out Mr. Amery's plans.

When the Japanese first entered Burma, the various anti-imperialist organisations formed a Burma National Army under the command of General Aung San. This army cooperated with the Japanese against the British. But when the Burmese discovered that the Japanese military commander in Burma had no intention of implementing the promise of the Japanese Foreign Office to grant Burma complete independence, the National Army withdrew its support and later joined with the British 14th Army in expelling the Japanese from Rangoon.

The Burmese, the first Asiatic people to be 'liberated,' have discovered that the Japanese are just as imperialistic as the whites, despite their slogan: 'Asia for the Asiatics'. And that they will have to depend upon themselves in the future if real freedom is to be achieved.

"Their nationalism is intense", observes *The Times* Special Correspondent in Rangoon. "Their aim," he asserts, "is simple—full independence for Burma. It is this aim which has dictated their actions during the past four years. Dominion status, it may be frankly said, makes little appeal for them, although many realise the advantages of membership of the Commonwealth, they do not realise that Dominion status would give them freedom to decide for themselves whether to remain in the Commonwealth, and freedom also to conduct their foreign affairs and conclude alliances if desirable with their neighbours, India, China and Siam."¹

It is obvious that the Tories are preparing to resolve this fundamental conflict between the political aspirations of the Burmese people and die-hard Imperialism by force of arms. Not without reason, Mr. W. G. Cove, M.P., declared that "we are prolonging British dictatorship in Burma," during the debate on the second reading of the Bill vesting autocratic powers in the Governor. However, Mr. Cove advised the Tories to learn from their Russian ally. "The only country in the world that is solving the problem of nationality is Russia," he asserted. "She has the means and a policy whereby she can meet the aspirations of these people. The old die-hard Imperialist Tory outlook will not fit in with the modern world."²

5. India.

There is little need to dilate upon the problem of this "jewel in the Crown of the British Raj." The causes of the present deadlock are too well-known. India has for some time been the running sore in the imperial body politic. Only a major political operation can now save the situation. But this is impossible within the framework of imperialist-colonial relations. It is possible by means of the Leninist method alone. It must be fully understood that the Indian

¹ *The Times*—May 31, "Nationalism in Burma"

² *Hansard*—June 1, 1945.

problem is fundamentally economic and social, and while political hegemony remains with British Imperialism the problem can never be solved. A culturally backward India is essential to British Imperialism, and that is why we say it is quite incapable of solving the Indian question. India, of all the Imperial possessions, provides the greatest tribute to the ruling class.

"If China means much in the life of every Britisher, India means much more," declared Upton Close in 1927. "Trade with this possession still totals more than that with any of the White Dominions. It oversteps every national item of British commerce save that of the United States. No railway crosses the six-thousand-mile-long British border between Persia and Indo-China, but 119 million dollars' worth of trade passes over it yearly on the backs of men and animals. The products carried between Bhamo, Burma, and Yunnanfu in China are worth annually eight million dollars. Can Great Britain keep this trade in her hands and yet stand out against the native nationalist aspirations?"¹

Mr. Winston Churchill himself answered this question in 1930, when he addressed the Indian Empire Society. "We have no intention of casting away that most truly bright and precious jewel in the Crown of the King, which more than all our other Dominions and dependencies constitutes the glory and strength of the British Empire,"² he proclaimed.

Since that time Mr. Churchill has not changed his view. He has unequivocally asserted that he has not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. This position, however, is clearly understandable. The continuance of British Imperialism is a vital necessity for the British ruling class. What is deplorable is the attitude of certain so-called Socialists like Sir Stafford Cripps, who allow themselves to be used as the servants of British Imperialism. There was a time when Sir Stafford Cripps was outspoken in his condemnation of imperialist rule and posed as an aggressive supporter of self-determination for India and other Colonial countries.³ It

¹ Upton Close: *The Revolt of Asia*, pp. 186-187.

² December 12, 1930.

³ Speech delivered at the Conference on Peace and Empire under the chairmanship of Jawaharlal Nehru at Friends House, London, July 15-16, 1938.

seems, however, that quite a number of people on the Left become ardent patriots as soon as the 'mother' country goes to war and, like Sir Stafford Cripps, undergo a sea-change in political outlook. There are a number of people on the Left who support some kind of Indian self-government which they would make dependent upon that country's support of Britain's war effort. These people are prepared to support any scheme for the "liquidation" of Imperialism providing that it is put off for an indefinite period, while meantime the Indian people can be utilised, in return for a few precarious concessions, as adjuncts to the struggle against rival Imperialisms.

These Social-Imperialists do not see the claims of the subject peoples to Self-Determination as a fundamental right of all peoples, regardless of their stage of social development, but as a bargaining weapon in the game of power politics. Indians, Africans, Ceylonese, Burmese, West Indians, Arabs—all Colonial peoples, no less than Europeans—have an inalienable right to their freedom without being under any obligation to help their Imperialist masters pull their chestnuts out of the fire. The principle of Self-Determination admits of no equivocation. People have a right to be free—today and not tomorrow. And those Socialists who assume the pontifical right of determining who will be free today and who tomorrow are reflecting the typical arrogance of the British ruling class towards the coloured peoples of the Empire.

There is also a widely held view that the populations of Colonial territories do not generally wish to be rid of British rule, and that claims for independence are largely instigated by disgruntled agitators, pursuing selfish aims. Quite a large section of the so-called Left also shares this view, by which they give support to the Imperialists who use it as a pretext for continuing their domination. "We hear it said of India, of Ireland, of the Negro, of the proletariat that they would be perfectly contented if it were not for agitators who work up the people to demand a freedom of which they are incapable and which they do not really want. The peculiar fact is the recurrence of this phenomenon in every case where there is repression. It is not true, as is alleged, that the agitators are merely psychological or moral perverts who are evacuated

by self-interest. Their type is much the same in whichever of the groups they are found. They are symbols of the psychosis of the group, and are the stuff of which martyrs are made. Sometimes they are personally normal and eminent, and sometimes they are excitable and fanatical, but in either case they are the product of the condition under which they develop. They discover that, as members of the nationality or class to which they belong, there are limitations placed upon them of which they cannot help becoming conscious, and they react to that consciousness on behalf of the whole group. When the movement has gained some momentum, the leaders become identified with it in a peculiar way, so that the mass feels that any attack on the leader or agitator, according to the point of view, is an attack upon themselves. It is a customary procedure to try to suppress these leaders, and invariably the result is an increase in the solidarity of the group behind them, which it is the real object to suppress."¹

Right of Self-Determination is Indivisible.

All these arguments are subterfuges disguising the refusal to recognise the right of all peoples to Self-Determination. And this right carries with it the privilege of the people concerned to decide themselves whether or not they want to fight in any particular war. The acid test of national freedom is this right of peoples to decide their own foreign policy. It is conceivable in the concrete situation today that if the Indian peoples enjoyed national freedom they would voluntarily give their wholehearted support to the war, not for British Imperialism, but to defend their newly won freedom against Japanese aggression. It is not for any of us to determine the future policy of a free India. That is a matter for the Indians to decide.

A subject people may be dragged into imperialist struggle through open nor disguised coercion, but such 'co-operation' carries no enthusiasm and in the nature of modern warfare is more or less worthless. A people can only give of its best when it feels it has something to fight for. The Soviet peoples, and the Chinese—the most civilised and

¹ Herbert A. Miller: *Races, Nations and Classes*, pp. 120 ff. Quoted by Hans Kohn in *Imperialism and Nationalism*, pp. 64-65.

peaceful of people—have demonstrated to the world what a tremendous and heroic self-sacrifice a people can exhibit once it is inspired by some ideal in whose achievement it feels it will have a part.

The peoples of the Soviet East, Moslem races, former subjects of an Empire even more oppressive than the British, achieved just over a quarter of a century ago not only national freedom but social emancipation, thanks to Lenin's policy. Today, the Russian people, having disencumbered themselves of their Imperialist baggage, have found among these millions of the Soviet East enthusiastic friends and allies, who flew to arms at once in the common cause. The Asiatic peoples of the Soviet Union are not fighting for the Russian people, but with the Russians and other peoples of the U.S.S.R. in defence of a common heritage. This point, frequently stressed by Soviet leaders, is, for reasons which will be quite obvious, conveniently ignored by Anglo-American commentators. Illustrative of the present attitude of the former Colonial peoples of the Czarist Empire is that of the Uzbeks, as expressed in a collective letter to their sons at the front, carrying 2,412,000 signatures. In this they "compare the Soviet Union to a fortress in which sixteen brothers live in friendship and together defend it against enemies from without. They address their warrior children in these words: 'Free sons and daughters of the Uzbek people! The German robber has broken into the home of your elder brother, Russia, into the homes of your elder brothers, the Byelorussians and Ukrainians. He brings a brown plague, the gallows, the knout, hunger and death. But the home of the Russian is also our home, the home of the Byelorussian and Ukrainian is our home. For the Soviet Union is a courtyard and the economy is one and indivisible. . . . Be among the best sons of your family, and among the best fighters of the Soviet peoples.'"¹

Can anyone imagine such a manifesto being written by coloured races of any part of the far-flung Indian and British Colonial Empires? Even so-called British Socialists do not seem to be able to recognise the fundamental distinction between fighting 'for' and fighting 'with'. For instance, in their support of India's right to Self-Determination (or is

¹ Quoted in *Soviet War News*, June 28, 1944.

it Dominion status?) they approach the problem like petty shopkeepers. To them it is not a question of India's inviolable right to independence, regardless of the attitude of the Indian peoples to Britain's war. Theirs is a purely opportunistic tactic: if India is prepared to support British imperialists against their Japanese rivals, then, and only then, are they prepared to recognise India's claim to Self-Determination. With Lenin how different. He and his party demanded and fought for the right of Self-Determination of the subject peoples of the Czarist Empire even to the point of secession; that is, regardless of whether they wanted to come within the Soviet and help to fight the enemies of the Revolution. Hence the contrasting picture today of united Soviet peoples opposing in fraternal solidarity the common enemy, and disgruntled Colonial peoples of the British Empire, many of whom, as in Malaya and Burma, actively supported Japan.

The facts which we have recited are historically incontrovertible, and are largely admitted even by Imperialist commentators. We have emphasised them in an attempt to make convincing the reasons for the different attitudes of the Asiatic peoples of the Soviet Union and those of the British Empire in Asia. The Soviet Union is far from being an earthly paradise, but the October Revolution was not used simply to secure the social emancipation of the Great Russians and other Slav peoples only. It was used to break the yoke of Czarist Imperialism which had for so many centuries been bearing down the non-Russian peoples of the Empire.

As equal citizens, the coloured races of the Soviet East look forward to the future with hope, but those subject peoples bound to Western European Imperialism have no reason to hope. Has not Mr. Churchill declared that they are not included within the scope of the Atlantic Charter? While the democratic principles for which Britain professes to stand may be operative to a greater or lesser degree among the white peoples of her Empire, they are consistently denied to her coloured subjects. British democracy is fundamentally a democracy of colour; a minority of less than 70 million whites enjoy rights denied to 500 million coloured people. Civil and political disabilities do exist in the Soviet Union, but they exist for all—Europeans and Asiatics, Russians and

non-Russians alike. Stalin does not use pigmentation as a screen for the denial of popular rights. And this is the reason, all the criticism notwithstanding, for the greater admiration among the coloured races of Asia and Africa for the Soviet system than for Anglo-Saxon democracy. Political democracy, as we know it, is circumscribed at the present time in the U.S.S.R., but this shortcoming is not inherent in a socialised economic system. On the contrary, one of the basic postulates of Socialist ideology and one much stressed by Lenin is the broader popular democratic base which such a Soviet system provides. The restrictions which have been the main target of British Left-Wing and Liberal critics of the Soviet Union living comfortably in the metropolis of the Empire and enjoying directly or indirectly the spoils of Imperialism, can be traced immediately to the isolation in which the failure of the Socialist Revolution in the West left the U.S.S.R. If those same Left-wing critics had been as diligent in exposing the inequalities of Imperialist exploitation in which they shared and in eradicating that system of racial inequality which exists within their Empire, they would have contributed excessively to the liberalising of political democracy and the widening of civil liberties in the Soviet Union. It is a pity that those who deprecate the shortcomings of the Soviet system refuse to recognise the greater lack of political, economic and ethnic democracy obtaining in their Colonial Empire. Surrounded by hostile capitalist and Imperialist States, attempting in the face of tremendous difficulties and obstacles to build up an industrial structure in an overwhelmingly agrarian country, forced to establish, maintain and expand an army against the constant threat of external intervention, the Soviet leaders are not altogether to blame for imposing a curtailment of democracy. To a very large extent this curtailment of political democracy was the result of circumstances, and now that the stability of the State has proved itself in the course of the war steps will undoubtedly be taken to widen its scope. For once the economic power of the capitalists has been broken, the groundwork has been laid for political and racial democracy. The signs all point to a progressive increase in democratic rights in the Soviet Union. And the coloured peoples of the Soviet East will share these equally with the rest of the population.

Race, Politics and War.

Ethnic democracy in 'plural' or multi-racial societies is as important as political democracy. The whole question of 'race' has been made one of the principal ideological instruments of aggressive Imperialism. Hitler has used it in Europe to promote his 'New Order,' and the Japanese Imperialists are using it in Asia to advance Japan's 'East Asia Co-Prosperity' policy. Projected as this question of race has been into the forefront of power politics, it urgently demands solution. A decisive solution, however, is impossible within the framework of the present system of Capitalism-Imperialism, since the problem of 'race' is but one of the sharper facets of the crisis in which the whole system now finds itself, and has direct connection with the Colonial Question and the present World War. "Every war," maintained Lenin, "is inseparably connected with the political system which gives rise to it. The politics which a certain country, a certain class in that country, pursued for a long period before the war are invariably pursued by that very same class during the war; it merely changes its form of action."¹

Examined on the basis of this determining principle, the war has fallen into three main and distinct categories:

1. *The purely inter-Imperialist conflict between Anglo-American capitalism on the one hand, and Axis capitalisms and their satellites on the other.*
2. *The defensive war of the Soviet Union—a collectivistic state—against predatory German Imperialism. The principal consideration of the U.S.S.R. is security against hostile capitalist intervention. This can best be achieved by the socialist revolution in Western Europe, but failing this the Soviet leaders are forced to rely upon military and diplomatic methods.*
3. *The Sino-Japanese conflict, in which we have a semi-colonial country (China) defending itself against Imperialist aggression and annexation.*

These three wars, therefore, have had distinctive and separate political objectives. As a result, however, of Axis action they have been merged militarily on a global scale. The

¹ Lenin: *War and the Workers*, pp. 6-7. Little Lenin Library, Vol. XX.

resultant combined anti-Fascist front is being exploited by certain sections of the Left in Britain to justify support for British Imperialism and Tory foreign policy.

Germany and Japan embarked on aggression, attempting to redistribute the world to their advantage. On the other side, Britain and America are opposed to any such redivision, since it can only be made at their expense, as the acquisition of territories by Japan in the Pacific and Far East has shown. These colonies, offering sources of raw materials and markets, are the spoils for which Germany and Japan went to war against the Anglo-American and Dutch Imperialists who controlled them. For Japan it was a comparatively easy matter to wrest the Pacific Islands and the territories bringing her on to the Indian frontier, since they are, so to speak, on her doorstep. Germany, however, in order to reach out to the rich colonial territories of Asia and Africa had first to attempt the conquest of Europe. In the course of her march on the road of Imperial aggrandisement, Germany widened her productive resources by the acquisition of the output of the European countries she had conquered. Such acquisition added to her arsenals of war. Her geographical position, however, dictated these preliminary conquests, which in no wise affected the ultimate objective of a world-wide Colonial Empire.

"The fundamental fact about these wars," observed an organ of American monopoly-capitalism, "is that they are being waged to decide who is going to control business in the future, and how it is going to be done. That is why we have sent a force of American soldiers to protect the bauxite deposits of Dutch Guiana, and why American warships guard the sea lanes to the Orient. . . . The trade which now flows across national frontiers is essential to the maintenance of an industrial economy. All the nations of the world are deciding how that economy will operate in future years."¹ Big business is well aware of the aims of the war, knows that the struggle between the Axis and the 'democratic' Powers constitutes an Imperialist conflict.

Modern war, by its very nature and because of its strategy, cannot be confined to any particular geographical area or national groupings. Hence, after nearly two years of

¹ Cleveland Trust Company Business Bulletin, December 15, 1941.

armed conflict, Germany, in pursuit of her imperialistic objective and to replenish her larder and stocks of wheat from the Ukraine and oil from the Caucasus before attempting a direct challenge to Britain and America, drew the Soviet Union into the general maelstrom.

Although forced against its will into the primarily imperialist conflict, the Soviet Union, unlike the Axis and their 'democratic' adversaries, has no imperialist aims, its sole objective being to defend and secure its frontiers and the collective achievements of the workers, peasants and intellectuals. Having abandoned the capitalist system of private ownership of the means of production and distribution, there are no monopoly capitalist pressure groups using the State to promote and defend the selfish interests of 'free enterprise.' Consequently, the Soviet Union seeks no markets, sources of raw materials or spheres for the investment of finance-capital abroad. It therefore cannot have imperialist aims. Bureaucracy or no bureaucracy, the Soviet Union is defending a higher socio-economic form of society than predatory capitalism, and therefore is waging a socially progressive war, even though its leaders are waging it in alliance with Imperialist Powers.

Similarly, China, even headed by the anti-Socialist, anti-Communist Kuomintang,¹ is fighting a progressive war of national liberation, even though it fights on the same side with Britain, the enslaver of China's neighbours—India and Burma. Weak peoples fighting for self-preservation cannot afford to pick and choose their allies. The Chinese people are defending themselves against Japanese Imperialism, which seeks to deprive them of their national sovereignty, reduce them to the Colonial status of Africans and Indians, and exploit their labour and natural resources in the interests of Japanese capitalism. This distinguishes China's struggle, for instance, from that of the Dutch, who, having been liberated by Anglo-American arms from the Germans, are fighting not for the emancipation of the 60 million coloured people of the Netherlands Indies, but rather to continue to hold them in subjection. China's struggle is an inspiration

¹ See *China Struggles for Unity*, by J. M. D. Pringle (Penguin) for a good factual account of the Generalissimo's counter-revolutionary record prior to the Sino-Japanese war.

to all oppressed peoples in Asia and Africa. Should China succeed in throwing off the Japanese yoke, it will blaze a path to the liberation of the East from all forms of Imperialism—'democratic' or totalitarian. The Chinese struggle, therefore, is historically progressive.

The fact that the Soviet Union and China happen to be linked up in the same military alignment with the Western 'democracies' in no way invalidates or alters our analysis of the multi-character of the present war. Nor does it change one whit the original Imperialist nature of the conflict between the Axis and Anglo-American capitalism. That the Soviet Union and China are allied with Britain and the U.S.A. is simply a matter of military expediency; it does not imply that the character of Anglo-American monopoly capitalism has experienced a fundamental change and that the interests of the four Great Powers have suddenly become inextricably intertwined.

Events at the San Francisco Conference have only served to underline the political differences which exist, even between the Anglo-Americans. After five years of comradeship in arms, their diplomatists squabbled over the methods of sharing out the colonies to be annexed from the defeated Powers on the one hand, while they united to oppose the Soviet and Chinese demand for colonial independence, on the other.

It was just over a decade ago, at the time of the attack on Manchuria, that Sir John Simon pleaded Japan's case at Geneva even better than the Japanese representatives, while "the report of the Lytton Commission (August 1932) said many severe things about China, and stated Japan's case with sympathy and consideration."¹ No action was taken by the Western democracies to check Japan's wanton attack upon China, which Mr. Leopold Amery, Secretary for India, justified on the grounds that Japan was carrying out her civilising mission in the Far East. "Japan has got a very powerful case based upon fundamental realities," he said in 1933. "... When you look at the fact that Japan needs markets and that it is imperative for her in the world in which she lives that there should be some sort of peace and

¹ Sir John Pratt: *Japan and the Modern World*, p. 15 (Oxford Pamphlet).

order, then who is there amongst us to cast the first stone and to say that Japan ought not to have acted with the object of creating peace and order in Manchuria and defending herself against the continual aggression of Chinese nationalism? Our whole policy in India, our whole policy in Egypt, stands condemned if we condemn Japan."

China was not embraced as Britain's ally during all the time (4½ years) that Japan was bombing her defenceless millions. Almost up to the very entry of Japan upon the scene of the present war against the 'democracies,' British policy had sustained Japanese action in China, and it was only just prior to Nippon's bombardment of Pearl Harbour that this policy gyrated somewhat, as though not quite sure whether appeasement were really succeeding or not. The British Government oscillated between closing the Burma Road or keeping it open, and finally closed it, thus cutting off China's life line. Only with the threat to the Far Eastern colonies was China accepted as Britain's ally, and then really because the Chinese Army offered the sole means of operating on the Asiatic mainland. There is no fundamental community of interest between China and Britain; there is only a temporary mutual military necessity. It would be folly to maintain that there is a community of interest in view of the fact that Britain, stripped of Hong Kong, has refused to surrender her claims to its recovery.

Japan only became an 'Imperialist aggressor' when she directly challenged Anglo-American interests in the Far East, where her military achievements, great though they have been, are due more to the ineptitude of her opponents' politics than to anything else. She is able to exploit the 'Asia for the Asiatics' propaganda, because she knows that the only way to counter this form of demagogy is for Britain to concede the right of Self-Determination to India, Burma and the British Colonies occupied by Japan. The present situation in Burma and India demonstrates most palpably that military warfare is governed by politics. This is because war is a continuation of policy by other means. "There are wars and wars," wrote Lenin. "We must examine the historical conditions which give rise to each particular war, the class which conducts it, and for what objects."

TORY BLUE-PRINT OF POST-WAR EMPIRE

WHAT are the objects of the British Imperialist class which is directing this 'sacred war against Fascism?' For some time past these political objectives have been made the subject of detailed plans. The design of the post-war world in relation to the Colonies was worked out by the Tories long before the military issue in Europe had been determined and the enemy defeated. For example, the directors of the London Tin Corporation, a company which has large interests in Far East mines, especially in Malaya, are calling for an international consultative body for the industry to take the place of the pre-war International Tin Restriction Committee, which was run by the producers. The Corporation "has supplied the necessary information for resuming production to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the broad basis of the group of companies as a whole," says the chairman, Mr. J. Ivan Spens.¹ So much for the industrial aspect of colonial development.

What might be termed the Tory political blue-print of post-war Colonial Imperialism has been put forward by Field Marshal Smuts, who was the strategist of the Mandates System of Colonial redistribution at the 1918 peace.² It was he who was mainly responsible for drafting the clauses which made it possible for South Africa to annex the mandate of South West Africa, and for other British Dominions to put in a claim for nearby Colonies formerly in the possession of defeated enemies. The Mandates System was a screen which, in the words of the noted historian, H. A. L. Fisher, draped the crudity of conquest in the veil of morality. It

¹ *The Times*: October 20, 1944.

² In formulating the Mandates System, Smuts was aided by Lord Lothian then Mr. Philip Kerr, Lloyd George's Private Secretary. See Parker T. Moon, *Imperialism and World Politics*.

was a complete blind, which managed to hoodwink quite a large section of popular opinion, even British Socialists. As Marshal Smuts put it himself so very recently, "The mandatory system was introduced to solve the difficult question of annexation. The Senate will remember that after the last war there was a strong feeling against the annexation of territories, and to overcome this difficulty the mandatory system was introduced. There is a feeling in many quarters that the mandatory system has outlived its time, and that another arrangement must be made that will have to be decided in the future. As far as South Africa is concerned, there is a mandate in South West Africa, and I have been asked whether the Government intended to incorporate that territory and whether there is any objection to that course. Personally I do not believe that there is any constitutional difficulty, even under existing mandate conditions."¹

Smuts on Regionalism.

But to safeguard against any such difficulty, Marshal Smuts's newly formulated Imperialism bases itself upon a kind of condominium, which will supersede mandates. Briefly, his plan is to group British Colonial regions into federal units according to their geographical position. For example, the Caribbean territories, including British Guiana and British Honduras, will be united into a kind of West Indian Federation under a joint Anglo-American Commission, in which Canada will also participate. The West African Colonies of Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast and Nigeria, together with adjoining French regions, will be brought into a West African federation. Here again America will be offered certain interests in view of the proximity of points like Dakar and Bathurst, Freetown and Monrovia, to the South American countries (Brazil in particular). In East Africa, a similar group will comprise Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, British, French and Italian Somaliland and part of the Abyssinian, Somali and Ogaden provinces, under South African and British control. The native territories of Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland, now British protectorates, will be incorporated into the Union of South Africa; and the two Rhodesias and Nyasaland, with the

¹ Address to the South African Senate, April 3, 1944.

Belgian Congo and the Portuguese territory of Mozambique, will be linked up to form a Central African bloc. This would provide new lands for the increased white population which the South African Governments intend to promote as a means of augmenting the present white minority population, to counter the vast black populations in these regions. They will also provide an internal market for the Union industries which have come into being since the outbreak of this war, and which will have to be turned over to peace-time manufactures in order to stave off unemployment and economic collapse.

A similar scheme is envisaged for the islands of the Pacific and the regions of East Asia. In that part of the world, England and America, Australia and New Zealand, will operate as joint partners. Certain territorial concessions may be made to China, but Britain still intends to hold Hong Kong and also sole control of India and Burma.

This, in very simplified outline, is the Tory plan for post-war Empire, and viewed realistically, this scheme of 'regional' administration of Colonial territories will provide easy opportunity for the annexations for which the Mandates System has prepared the way. Nevertheless, there are a number of primary considerations which the scheme does not entirely manage to co-ordinate.

Let us take first the question of sovereignty, a fundamental one. For political control reserves the right to the Colonial Power to place its own nationals on the administration and gives it economic prerogatives. A principle of Marshal Smuts's scheme is that the possessing Powers shall retain political control of their Colonies. His suggested Regional Councils are to be purely consultative and shall have no administrative or executive powers. Representation on these Councils will be allowed to States having interests of an economic or strategic nature in the region concerned, even though they may not actually have Colonies there. This provision will allow a voice to British Dominions and America in areas in which they consider themselves to have interests.

United States' representation on a number of the Councils is a concession to America's dominant imperialist position in world affairs today. Production potential in the U.S.A. has

increased enormously during the war, so that even the vast continental domestic market will be unable to absorb her industrial output. Wall Street is accumulating greater and greater financial reserves, for which it must seek avenues of investment abroad. Marshal Smuts believes that, the participation of America in his 'Regional' set-up would offer her appropriate markets for capital goods and machinery. All of this will be a welcome necessity to settlers in South Africa and the Rhodesias, who have not themselves the resources with which to expand their industries.

It is quite true that American Big Business does not seem anxious to acquire political control of Colonies, at any rate in Africa. Dollar diplomacy can secure to the United States all the advantages it seeks without the responsibilities of policing overseas territories with Marines. This attitude is not evidence of any unique aversion of American Imperialism from expanding territorially, but is rather the outcome of its world economic superiority. America stands today in that same position which Britain occupied in the middle of the last century, when she was the workshop of the world, its banker and shipper; when Disraeli could say: "Colonies are millstones around our neck." Today America has wrested from Britain her former industrial and financial supremacy, and it is Mr. Truman and not Mr. Churchill who can describe Colonies as "millstones around our neck." Shortly before his death, Mr. Roosevelt was able to declare for Philippines independence before the due date of 1946. He also recommended to Congress that self-government be extended to Puerto Rico as a step towards either complete 'independence' or inclusion as another state within the U.S.A. When you are rich you can afford to be generous.

Whether, however, America participates in any scheme of international co-operation or resumes her inter-war role of isolationism is all one as far as her world economic dominance is concerned. In an imperialistic age, America, the greatest Imperialist Power, must play lead, and all other interests will finally be subordinated to hers.

International co-operation such as that envisaged in Marshal Smuts's proposal will, there is no doubt, provide a means of satisfying the 'Open Door' policy and the 'Most Favoured Nation' principle which leading Americans are

demanding, although others, in particular the late Wendell Willkie, look upon any retention of political Empire as standing in the way of Yankee interests. Mr. Willkie represented that point of view which believes that if Colonial territories are free from the political control of European Governments, especially Britain, the native capitalists are more likely to turn to Wall Street than to the City of London for the capital machinery and financial assistance that they will require to establish some kind of modern industry in their new sovereign States. This is the motive of Mr. Willkie's advocacy of Colonial independence, which is a very clever manoeuvre.

Because it is not unlikely that the co-operation of America in exploiting the natural resources of Africa and other parts of the British Empire will to a very great extent suit the interests of Yankee capitalism and British colonisers, there is a busy attempt to popularise the new idea of 'Regionalism.' It is accompanied by a new dictionary of euphemisms. 'Regionalism' is substituting 'mandates' and 'partnership' will oust 'trusteeship.'

Association of natives on the Regional Council is one of the proposals, behind which can be detected a very tricky device to put off self-government of those territories which are considered to be almost 'ripe' for it at the present time, while the need of independence of more backward countries cannot possibly have any *raison d'être* in a regionally constituted world. The British Tories intend to meet the national aspirations of the native peoples, which have been stimulated and reinforced by the lofty ideals embodied in the Atlantic Charter and Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, by offering very minor representation through members of their intelligentsia on councils, commissions and legislative bodies, and a wider participation in local administrative services, hitherto exclusively reserved for Britishers. In this way it is hoped to placate public opinion both in Britain and the Colonies themselves, but there should be no shadow of doubt that administrative control will not be transferred to the Colonial peoples. The Governor will always be there to exercise his powers of determination and veto. Even where a wider democracy is permitted through the Constitution (Jamaica has been given universal suffrage) the ultimate result will be

the same as it is in Ceylon, which has the most advanced Constitution of all the British Colonies. The Governor's veto decided affairs in the final resort, and in most instances the wishes of the people come to nothing.

Viewed pragmatically, Marshal Smut's scheme provides possibilities for meeting the post-war needs of British capitalism in the Colonial sphere. Even as the Mandates System carried over British Imperialism between the First and Second World Wars, 'Regionalism' will contrive to carry it over into the Third World War.

Almost fifty years ago, Cecil Rhodes, that greatest of Empire builders, maintained that the Empire "is a question of the stomach. If you do not want civil war, you must become imperialists." This attitude has been re-stated very lately by none other than the Dominions Secretary, Viscount Cranbourne. Talking to the Scottish Unionist Association in Edinburgh on October 22, 1943, he told the Tories that those people who could not look beyond their personal interests should remember that their employment and standard of living depended mainly on the existence of the Empire. "The vital trade with the Dominions and Colonies," he said, "amounts approximately to nearly half of the whole of Britain's trade with the rest of the world. Without it there would be no future for Britain. We would degenerate into a small, insignificant over-populated island." It is not accidental that Lord Cranborne was the representative of the United Kingdom Government on the Colonial Committee at San Francisco. The colonial interests of the Tories was safe in his hands.

Labour and the Empire.

Tory thinking on Empire is realistic. Its policy, therefore, is a quite definite one. The Labour Party, the organised expression of the British workers, on the other hand, has no individual Colonial policy. Regarding its existence, as it does, to be bound up with the continuation of Empire, it supports the Imperialist policy of the Tories. British Imperialism has had the support of the leaders of organised labour by sharing with them some of the spoils of its Colonial exploitation, which makes Labour the defender of British Imperial interests whenever they are threatened.

Engels commented upon this pro-imperialist outlook of British Labour as far back as 1882 in a letter to Kautsky, when he wrote: "You ask me what the English workers think of colonial policy? Exactly the same as they think about politics in general, the same as what the bourgeoisie think. There is no working class party here, there are only Conservatives and Liberal-Radicals, and the workers merrily devour with them the fruits of the British colonial monopoly and of the British monopoly of the world market." While to Marx he wrote even earlier (1858), "The British working class is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat as well as a bourgeoisie. Of course, this is to a certain extent justifiable for a nation which is exploiting the whole world."¹

This prophecy of Engels' has been fulfilled to the letter. Today the British Labour Movement stands as the expression of a bourgeois proletariat. And particularly on Imperial and Colonial questions it has no definite programme of its own to set against that of the Right. Take, for example, the recent debate on Burma. On June 1, 1945, Mr. Amery on behalf of the Tories came before the House of Commons with a Bill in which he demanded dictatorial powers for the Governor during the transition years from military administration to the restoration of the form of government the country enjoyed before the Japanese invasion. The policy envisaged under the Bill is definitely a reactionary one unlikely to find approval among even moderate Burmese political leaders. After a number of Tory members had given their blessings to Mr. Amery for preserving their imperial interests in that part of the Empire, Mr. W. G. Cove, a left-wing Labour member, had the courage to criticise strongly the proposals outlined in the Bill, declaring that "it was a tragedy that at this juncture in world affairs Mr. Amery should be Secretary of State, because he (Mr. Amery) had said in 1931 that we could not object to Japanese aggression in Manchuria because if we did we would condemn our control and government of India and Burma." At this stage of the debate, Mr. A. Creech Jones, the Labour

¹ Lenin *On Britain*, p. 65. Marxist-Leninist Library, Vol. XVIII.

Party Colonial Affairs spokesman, intervened and dissociated himself from his colleague's remarks. He informed the Tories that he was instructed to endorse Mr. Amery's Bill on behalf of the Parliamentary Labour Party.

To understand properly this bankruptcy of the Labour Party it is necessary to review briefly its historical background. Unlike the Liberal Party, which it superseded after the last war as the official Opposition, the Labour Party was originally conceived by its founders not simply as offering an alternative Government to run the capitalist system, but to wage a political struggle as a means of bringing about a transformation of property relations with all its social implications. The Liberal Party, for instance, differed from the Tory Party only as to the methods of running the capitalist system; it never challenged the fundamental social and economic structure of British society. On the other hand, the Labour Party in its early days did at least pose a theoretical challenge to the existing social order, though one might disagree with the methods proposed for bringing about the change. Unlike scientific Marxists, the Labour leaders of the early period envisaged the change in the social system through evolutionary constitutional means. That is to say, they hoped that at some time the electorate would return to office Labour Governments, which would, by legislative enactments, achieve Labour's objective. This theoretical prognosis was always disputed by revolutionary Socialists, who maintained that even if Labour did ever secure a majority at Westminster the ruling class would resort to illegal measures to prevent such a transition. But we are not here concerned with the polemics of reformism versus revolution, for history has already resolved this question as far as Britain is concerned. How has this come about?

As it developed into a mass organisation, the Labour Party became more and more dependent upon the trade unions for financial support and as vote gathering apparatus. For this financial and political support it has been obliged to pay a great price: it has been obliged to abandon its early theoretical programme. Unlike these socialist idealists, the trade union leaders have never really been converted to the socialist objective, even though they have given lip service to it. Their concern has been to guard and advance the trade

union interests of their members, and they have used their positions in the Labour Party to impose their aims. These aims have been to wring concessions from the ruling class, and they have come progressively to the point of view that if the capitalist class is to be in a position to accede to their economic demands, that class must have their support whenever its position is threatened. The result has been that whenever British Capitalism-Imperialism has been faced with a crisis, the Trade Union leaders have not utilised that crisis to forward the socialist aims of the Labour Party, but rather they have joined forces with the capitalist class to resolve the crisis. An ideological union has come about between the leaders of Labour and of Capital on the basis of Empire. This tacit agreement between the Tories on the Right and the Trade Union leaders on the Left constitutes the historic basis of Reformism in the British Labour Movement.

The Empire is conceived as a world wide trading concern owned by the British capitalist class and operated primarily in the interests of that class. And since the reforms desired by the Labour leaders for the working class in the metropolis derive from the spoils of Empire, these leaders have, willy nilly, been forced into the role of junior partners in the Imperialist concern. They conclude that without tribute from the Empire they will be unable to obtain these concessions, except they are prepared to challenge openly the whole fundamental basis of British Imperialism. But this position they have not taken up, as they are unwilling to take the risk. So they are now pursuing a conscious policy which is the outcome of the conclusion they have arrived at: that the standard of living of the British workers can only be maintained and perhaps extended on the basis of Empire.

To further their point of view they regard and use the Labour Party, quite without deference to its professed socialist aims as a political apparatus which will look after the interests of trade unionists at Westminster. The Trade Union Congress leaders meet the bosses on the industrial sector, while the Trade Union M.P.s do so in the Parliamentary arena. In this way both angles of the joust for better working conditions are covered.¹

¹ Greeting the 1944 Trade Union Congress at Blackpool on behalf of the Labour Party, Ellen Wilkinson chided the trade union bosses on

One point we would like to stress in this appraisal of the stand of the Trade Union officials, who, thanks to the financial support of the Unions, dominate the Labour Party; and that is that the Fabian-Imperialist course they are pursuing is absolutely conscious. The concern of the leaders is now to try and persuade the rank and file membership to abandon the vestiges of anti-imperialism still clinging to the party and to support in an unqualified manner the Colonial system. There yet remains in its ranks, however, a number of idealists who wish to see the worst features of Colonial rule abolished or ameliorated, and as a sop to this orientation on the problems of Empire, the Executive from time to time issues pious resolutions, statements and manifestos, giving lip service to the aspirations of the subject peoples in terms of Dominion status for India by and by, and the gradual evolution of the Colonies of the West Indies and Africa towards self-government. This is nothing but demagoguery aimed at creating among the subject peoples the impression that the Labour Party stands for a fundamental change in the *status quo*. Nothing of the sort. While Mr. Bevin draws lances with Mr Churchill on domestic issues, the most radical reform he offers the Indians is to close down the India Office and put them under the Dominions Office.

The basic principles of Labour's Colonial thesis were revealed in all their glaring nakedness in a Parliamentary debate on the future of Empire.¹ And it was left to Mr. Emanuel Shinwell who, by his past record at Westminster, had earned for himself the reputation of a genuine Left Socialist, to expose the bare ribs of Labour's pro-imperialist leanings. Mr. Shinwell, seemingly having repented of his previous Left attitude, declared that "I have occasionally found myself in disagreement with my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister, but I am in hearty accord with the view he expressed some time ago on the suggested liquidation of the

their attitude towards the Labour Party. "Some of you are getting into the habit of treating the Labour Party as a poor relation. We are poor and we are a relation, but you need not treat us as though the Labour Party was a negligible quantity, because, if you do, the electors will believe you," declared Miss Wilkinson. She also asserted that "there is a growing tendency to treat M.P.s as union delegates rather than as representatives of a whole constituency."

¹ *Hansard*, April 20, 1944.

Empire. Sir, we have no intention, any of us, of throwing the British Commonwealth of Nations overboard to satisfy a section of the American Press, or indeed any one else." Having thus shown himself a supporter of the new Fabian-Imperialism, Mr. Shinwell presented his case very logically. "I ventured to cross swords very humbly with General Smuts who declared that after this war we should be a poor country," he said. "Of course we shall be a poor country, of course our plight will be precarious, of course we shall have to reduce the standard of life of our people, and, of course we shall become a second-rate or even a third- or fourth-rate Power unless we take appropriate steps to prevent it." And what are the appropriate steps proposed by Mr. Shinwell, spokesman of the Labour Party? "The Colonies," he maintained, "are not being developed in an economic sense as they ought to be . . . There should be an inquiry into the possibilities of expansion in all the Dominion countries, in India particularly, and in our Colonial possessions. . . . We ought to take accumulated savings and invest a great proportion of them in those Empire countries who need them—some of them do not need them, having large sterling balances—and particularly in the Colonies."

The *Daily Herald*, official organ of the Labour Party, observes in its editorial on Mr. Shinwell's speech, which supported a motion to promote post-war co-operation between the nations of the British Commonwealth, that "the motion was tabled in the names of Mr. Shinwell, a Socialist; Lord Winterton, a Conservative; Sir Edward Grigg, a die-hard Conservative, and Sir Herbert Williams, an ultra-Conservative."¹ Clear evidence, this, of the close tie-up between the Tories and Labour on the basis of Imperialism. The *Herald* attempts to take Mr. Shinwell to task for his views, but in doing so itself exposes Labour's attitude on Empire. "He (Mr. Shinwell) was far too much concerned with answering 'sneers at the British Empire' and with giving superfluous assurances that we have no intention of 'throwing the British Commonwealth overboard.' Who ever seriously supposed we had?" asks the *Daily Herald*. "A Socialist can afford to ignore the critics of the Empire and to concentrate on the exposition of his Party's aims."

¹ *The Daily Herald*, April 25, 1944.

But since Mr. Arthur Greenwood, then official spokesman of the Labour Party in Parliament, fully endorsed Mr. Shinwell's views, we can only conclude that they also expressed the party's aims. Mr. Greenwood even went so far as to refer to Field-Marshal Smuts as "a man of great, ripe wisdom and a man whom we all honour," that same Field-Marshal Smuts whose Dominion of South Africa is notorious for its treatment of its majority black population. Marshal Smuts is the author of the Regionalism scheme, the latest device for joint Imperial control by the United Kingdom Government and the Dominions. This Regionalism has also received recognition and acceptance by the Labour Party, as testified in an official report of the National Executive issued on April 24, 1944. The report declares that "In regions such as Africa, South-East Asia, and the South-West Pacific, where neighbouring Colonies are administered by different Governments, we strongly recommend the early creation of Regional Councils to co-ordinate economic policy, with a view to making the interests of the Colonial peoples primary beyond all doubt." The Labour Party, judging from this document, stands, then, on the same side as the Tory Party, even though it may give lip service to the interests of the Colonial people as being primary in any system of Imperial rule. In fact, ever since Colonel Oliver Stanley, the Secretary of State for Colonies, adopted the Colonial Development and Welfare Plan, the Tories have appropriated more and more from the programme of the Fabians. Now there is hardly any difference between Tory 'Democracy' and Fabian-Imperialism on Colonial affairs.

Mr. A. Creech Jones, who has so often championed the Colonial peoples in Parliament and exposed their grievances, while under no particular obligation to do so, since they did not elect him, feels that "This country has an Empire it cannot shed," although he assumes that "it is our responsibility." Mr. Creech Jones understands the role of Monopoly Capitalism in the Colonies, and asks in an article on British Imperialism whether the Colonial territories are "moving to political and economic freedom."¹ He tells us that there are vested interests which must be removed,

¹ *British Imperialism and the Colonial Empire*, by A. Creech Jones, M.P., in *The Left News*, April, 1944.

and then demands: "But how is it to be done?" That, of course, is the questions which Colonials always ask. How is it to be done? How are vested interests to be removed? That was the burning question which faced Lenin, and we have seen how he solved it; how he removed the vested interests of Czarist Imperialism by superseding them entirely. And Lenin was faced also with the same problem of resolving the inequities and oppressions and disabilities suffered by the widespread populations of the Russian Empire. This, too, he did, as we have also seen, but only after having superseded the power which was exploiting them. Having achieved this prerequisite, Lenin drew those people into association with the former ruling nation, the Great Russians, by admitting the right of Self-Determination for the Colonial peoples and national minorities, by admitting them as free and equal partners into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

But when this question of how to achieve progress for the Colonial peoples of the British Empire is posed by official spokesmen of the Labour Party like Mr. Jones, a likely Colonial Secretary, all they propose is an extension of social welfare, more civil rights, greater trade union facilities. All these are very good suggestions, but it is quite legitimate to ask who is to allow all this, and how? For finally, of course, the financial question is the root problem of the extension of social well-being in the Colonies. This was clearly brought out in the case of the Sargent Plan for education in India, referred to in Chapter VI. This plan, drawn up by Mr. John Sargent, Commissioner of Education for India, was put on one side to wait "full realisation until India had increased its industrial and agricultural wealth to pay for it."

It is quite illusory for Labour Party idealists to imagine that wide schemes for improved education, extended social services and better economic conditions will be provided by the British ruling class in Colonial areas, when they have hesitated to implement the Beveridge plan at home. Many of these people fall back upon the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940, which was passed largely to placate the populations of the West Indies, who had demonstrated their extreme dissatisfaction with British rule by a wave of militant strikes. Under the Act there was created the Colonial

Development and Welfare Fund, which was to devote £5,000,000 a year over a period of ten years towards the well-being of the Colonial territories of the Empire (with a population of over 60,000,000) by way of rehabilitation schemes. A noteworthy feature of the Fund is that any part of the £5,000,000 not spent in any one year may not be carried over to the following year. The total expenditure up to the end of June 1943 out of the Fund was stated in Parliament to be only £742,924. In the same period, the Governors of the various Colonies contributed to the British Treasury in the name of the populations, in cash or interest-free loans between £40 and £50 millions, to assist Britain's war effort. What a great hoax this Fund is!¹

Yet the colonial theoreticians of the Labour Party fall back upon the Development and Welfare Act to correct the economic and social ills of the Colonies. It is their Bible, their rod and staff of Imperial progress. They use it to camouflage the pro-imperialist line of much of the Left. The Fabians have been delegated the role of anaesthetists, to administer the chloroform while the Trade Union officials assist the Imperialists in the operation on the victims. Their camouflage has the purpose of blurring the sharp pro-imperialist orientation of the T.U.C. with a pastel pink colouring. Ameliorative measures form the main plank of their platform, but the Parliamentary spokesmen of the Party undermine them by coming out openly and blatantly for what is now euphemistically termed the 'greater development of the Empire.' Literally translated, this means more intensive exploitation of the natural resources and labour power of the Colonial territories.

Labour Colonial Bureaucrats.

In fact, there is now a working tie-up between the Labour

¹ In October, 1944, the Colonial Office declared a profit of £3,676,253 accumulated from transactions in West African cocoa in 1939-1943. Instead of distributing the profit among the native producers or using it for promoting social services among the Africans, the Colonial Office will use the money to subsidise a Marketing Board set up as part of the British Ministry of Food and for a Cocoa Research organisation which it proposes to establish after the war. (Report on Cocoa Control in West Africa, Crnd. 6554.)

Party and the Colonial administration. For Transport House is working in collaboration with the Colonial Office in recommending trade union functionaries to go out to the Colonies to act as Labour Advisers and subordinate officials in the new labour departments which have been set up since the Imperial Government has recommended the extension of trade unions among Colonial workers. In the past, civil servants attached to the Colonial administrative organs were drawn exclusively from the middle classes; they were university men who used the Colonies as a career. But since the official recognition of trade unionism in the Colonies in 1940, there has been a departure from the traditional policy of appointment and trade unionists are being placed in the Colonial labour offices. These trade unionists, who were never Socialists at home, will not put themselves out to propagandize Socialist ideas among the native workers. The Colonial Office's enlistment of the active aid of the T.U.C. in supervising labour organisations in the subject territories is quite a brilliant piece of strategy. In doing this, it will use the British trade union appointees to put a curb upon the militancy of the native workers; for the intensification in the development of Colonial resources will bring forth the active opposition of the Colonial masses to the intensified oppression which it is bound to produce. The trade union men, as the servants of the Colonial Office in the labour departments of the Colonies, will have the task of maintaining industrial peace among the coloured under-paid workers.

There is no doubt that the Colonies, especially India, will be milked to restore Britain's declining capitalism. Mr. Shinwell has, in fact, done the ground work for the Tories, and how much better that he, a supposed Socialist, should have done it than they! He has filled out the framework of Marshal Smut's Regionalism, providing the economic content, dotting the i's and crossing the t's of the South African Premier's proposals. It is hoped to rally working class support behind an expansionist production programme by assuring the workers of Britain that this is the only way in which they can hope to ensure decent conditions of living at home, while the ruling class will continue to play its centuries-old game of power politics in opposition to the United States and the Soviet Union.

No sooner had the war in Europe come to a victorious conclusion, thanks to the stability and mighty power of the Soviet State, than the fundamental economic and political conflicts between the British and American capitalists on the one hand, and between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union on the other, broke into the open at San Francisco. Temporarily blurred by the exigent imperative for forming an anti-Hitler front, the essential differences between the 'United' Nations cannot be suppressed too long. Marshal Smut's scheme of Regionalism and Mr. Shinwell's detailed amplification of it are proposed as the *modus operandi* for meeting America's world imperialist hegemony.

It the British working class falls for these power-politics nostrums—and they will if no political party emerges to re-direct them into the path of Socialism—they will find themselves drawn into greater and more destructive wars. The fundamental problems posed before Britain and the world cannot be solved in terms of 'ultra-Imperialism,' or 'supra-Imperialism,' but only in terms of Socialism. It is, of course, possible to effect temporary adjustments, to establish some sort of patchwork pattern such as has been envisaged by the American Agreement. But no permanent solution of the problems of the British people is possible within the framework of the existing social system. More intensive exploitation of India and Africa must result in violent resistance from those people. And this resistance will react upon the stability of the Imperial structure, which will not gain strength as is maintained by those putting forward plans to better it, but will be progressively weakened by the energetic struggles of the exploited masses of the Colonial territories. It is well to remember that the British Empire is not a cohesive entity of white people. It includes 500 million coloured people as against 70 million whites. And even the adherence of the white section of the Empire is not permanently guaranteed. The Dominions of Australia, New Zealand and Canada are gravitating towards the United States, and the loyalty of the Union of South Africa is questionable. Marshal Smut is holding it to Great Britain at the moment, but when he is gone there will be a big drive from the Boer Nationalists, headed by Dr. Malan, to sever

the Imperial connection by declaring South Africa a "Fascist Christian National Republic."¹

'Regionalism' or any other plan designed to secure the more intensive exploitation of the Colonial masses can only destroy what remains of their traditional loyalty. In reality, the Imperialists are digging their own grave. It is significant that while Mr. Shinwell recognised that there are 13 million dissatisfied Negroes in America, he was unable to make a similar accusation against the Soviet Union, and it is quite certain that he would have no hesitation in doing so were Stalin vulnerable in that regard. The most he could say was that "even our friends of Soviet Russia, for sound and proper purposes, in order to safeguard themselves against possible aggression in the future, have sought to exercise, I shall not put it higher than this, a protectorate over other countries." Aggression from whom? Only from some Imperialist Power or Powers. Obviously not Germany, now prostrate. Which Power or combination of Powers only history will reveal.

These people may have plans for Empire, but history has its own logic. This war and the part which the Soviet Union in particular has played in it has done more to educate the workers of Britain and of all lands, not excluding the subject peoples of the Empire, on the fundamental merits of Socialism, even with the limitations of the present Soviet régime, over the present decaying system of Capitalism-Imperialism which reaction is making desperate attempts to keep alive. History, in fact, has done the job which the Labour Party was founded to do but rejected. But these reactionary elements, though they may try to cheat history and succeed in arresting temporarily the historical process, cannot do so for ever. As Lenin said, "the Social Revolution may meet with defeats and temporary setbacks, but only Socialism can lead humanity out of the blind alley into which it has now been dragged."

Fascism or Socialism?

Only two alternatives are offered by the historical circum-

¹ See Alexander Campbell's *Smuts and Swastika* (Gollancz) and *The Garment Worker*—official organ of the Garment Workers' Union of South Africa for May-June, 1944.

stances of the present: Fascism or Socialism. The question of Socialism no longer remains an academic one. The contradictions and seething conflicts which exploded in the present war will not be solved by the war. Indeed, its conclusion can only deepen and sharpen them. Arising out of the sufferings which the peoples of Europe have undergone in the course of the holocaust will be an exaggerated nationalism whose dimensions are already discernible. Dislike it we may, but ignore it we cannot. It is a factor which we must face realistically. But like the nationalist struggle of the subject peoples of the British and other Empires, it is just another aspect of the deep-rooted crisis of the social and political system and is impossible of solution within the capitalist social structure. The Soviet form of multi-national State gives the only real answer. Within the framework of such a State the pressing problems of frontiers, of monetary exchange, of tariff walls, of markets, of production and distribution, are at once capable of solution.

The political and economic differences rampant under the present system of Capitalism-Imperialism are, within the Soviet type of State, with its common ownership of productive means, its socialised and planned basis, sublimated into a broader and richer Cultural Nationalism which enhances the social unity of all the components. "In the old days, when the Czar, the capitalists, and the landlords were in power in our country, it was the policy of the government to make one people—the Russian people—the dominant people, and all other peoples subjugated and oppressed peoples. That was a bestial, a wolfish policy. In October, 1917, when the great proletarian revolution began in our country, when we overthrew the Czar, the landlords and capitalists, the great Lenin, our teacher, our father and tutor, said that henceforth there must be neither dominated nor subjugated peoples, that the peoples must be equal and free. In this way we buried the old Czarist bourgeois policy and proclaimed a new policy, a Bolshevik policy—a policy of friendship, a policy of brotherhood between the peoples of our country.

"Since then eighteen years have elapsed. And now we already see the beneficial results of this policy. The present conference is a vivid proof of the fact that the former mistrust between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. has long been laid

to rest, that the mistrust has been replaced by complete and mutual trust, that the friendship between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. is growing and gaining in strength. That, comrades, is the most precious thing that the Bolshevik national policy has given us.

"And friendship among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. is a great and important achievement. For as long as this friendship exists, the peoples of our country will be free and invincible. Nothing can daunt us, neither enemies at home nor enemies abroad, as long as this friendship lives and flourishes. You need have no doubt of that, comrades."¹

The means by which the Soviet Union solved its Colonial and National Problems inherited from Czarist Imperialism, and united the world's most heterogeneous ethnic society into a powerful State whose diverse peoples are culturally individual, but whose entity is economically and politically united, provides the finest guide to the solution of similar problems on a world-wide scale. Only when the subject peoples of Asia and Africa, and the national minorities of Europe are united within a Soviet form of multi-national State will the racial, religious and sectional frictions, and the conflicting interests which Imperialism breeds and exploits and which lead to constant wars, be at peace and live in harmony. For Imperialism divides: Socialism unites.

¹ Address by J. Stalin at Conference of Collective Farmers from the Asiatic republics of Turkmenistan and Tazikistan—Dec. 4, 1935.

INDEX

- AFRICA, 5, 9.
 American exploitation, 164.
 AFRIKAANS, 90.
 AGRICULTURE—mechanisation, 127.
 ALASKA, 7, 9.
 ALEUTIAN, 9.
 ALEXANDER I, 5.
 ALEXANDER II, 11, 15.
 ALEXANDER III, 11.
 ALEXAYEV, 48.
 ALPHABETIC CHANGES, 98.
 ALTAI REGION, 21.
 AMERY, LEOPOLD, on Japanese imperialism, 158.
 AMUR RIVER, 9.
 ANGLO-RUSSIAN AGREEMENT, 13.
 ANGLO-RUSSIAN RIVALRY, 12, 13.
 ANNAM—annexation by France, 9.
 APRIL THESIS OF LENIN, viii.
 ARCHANGEL, 51.
 ARDAHAN, 11.
 ARMENIA, 31, 52.
 — literacy, 96, 97.
 ARMENISN, 27.
 — pogroms, 18.
 — in Trans-Caucasia, 18.
 ASTRAKHAN, 4.
 ATLANTIC CHARTER AND COLONIAL PEOPLES, 153.
 AZERBAIJAN, 52.
 — annexation, 10.
 — books, 109.
 — industrialisation, 123.
 BAIKAL, lake, 8, 20.
 BALTIC, 2.
 — barons, 15, 16.
 — provinces, 5, 27, 40.
 — States, 60.
 BASHKIRS, 20, 92.
 — exploitation, 21.
 — rule by native chiefs, 21.
 BATUM, 21.
 BERLIN CONFERENCE SETTLEMENT, 11.
 BESSARABIA, 5.
 BIRO-BIDJAN, 82.
 BLACK SEA STEPPES, 4.
 BORHARA, 22.
 — women, 99.
 BOLSHEVIKS, ix, 37, 93.
 BOLSHEVIK party, viii, x.
 — clear objective conception, 47.
 BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION, x.
 BREST-LITOVSK, 43.
 BRITISH HUDSON BAY COMPANY, 7.
 BRITISH-JAPANESE ALLIANCE, 12.
 BRITISH LABOUR—bourgeois proletariat, 166.
 — defender of Empire, 165, 166.
 — share of imperialist spoils, 168.
 BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT—in effectuality, 47.
 — attitude to Colonial Empire, 35.
 BRITISH WORKING CLASS—a warning, 175.
 BUBNOV, x.
 BUDDHISM, 20.
 BURIAT MONGOLS, 20.
 — illiteracy, 30.
 — literacy, 94, 95.
 BURMA—constitution, 147.
 — dominion status claim, 145, 146.
 — national army, 147.
 — nationalism, 148.
 — persecution of nationalist leaders, 146.
 BYELORUSSIA, 27, 31.
 CATHERINE THE GREAT, 15.
 CATHERINE II, 4.
 CAUCASUS, 51.
 — conquest, 5.
 CENTRAL ASIA, 27, 51.
 — books, 109.
 — colonies, 11.
 — conquest, 11.
 — cultural and social backwardness, 29-30.
 — feminine emancipation, 99.
 — illiteracy, 31.

to rest, that the mistrust has been replaced by complete and mutual trust, that the friendship between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. is growing and gaining in strength. That, comrades, is the most precious thing that the Bolshevik national policy has given us.

"And friendship among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. is a great and important achievement. For as long as this friendship exists, the peoples of our country will be free and invincible. Nothing can daunt us, neither enemies at home nor enemies abroad, as long as this friendship lives and flourishes. You need have no doubt of that, comrades."¹

The means by which the Soviet Union solved its Colonial and National Problems inherited from Czarist Imperialism, and united the world's most heterogeneous ethnic society into a powerful State whose diverse peoples are culturally individual, but whose entity is economically and politically united, provides the finest guide to the solution of similar problems on a world-wide scale. Only when the subject peoples of Asia and Africa, and the national minorities of Europe are united within a Soviet form of multi-national State will the racial, religious and sectional frictions, and the conflicting interests which Imperialism breeds and exploits and which lead to constant wars, be at peace and live in harmony. For Imperialism divides: Socialism unites.

¹ Address by J. Stalin at Conference of Collective Farmers from the Asiatic republics of Turkmenistan and Tazikistan—Dec. 4, 1935.

INDEX

- AFRICA, 5, 9.
 American exploitation, 164.
 AFRIKAANS, 90.
 AGRICULTURE—mechanisation, 127.
 ALASKA, 7, 9.
 ALEUTIAN, 9.
 ALEXANDER I, 5.
 ALEXANDER II, 11, 15.
 ALEXANDER III, 11.
 ALEXAYEV, 48.
 ALPHABETIC CHANGES, 98.
 ALTAI REGION, 21.
 AMERY, LEOPOLD, on Japanese imperialism, 158.
 AMUR RIVER, 9.
 ANGLO-RUSSIAN AGREEMENT, 13.
 ANGLO-RUSSIAN RIVALRY, 12, 13.
 ANNAM—annexation by France, 9.
 APRIL THESIS OF LENIN, viii.
 ARCHANGEL, 51.
 ARDAHAN, 11.
 ARMENIA, 31, 52.
 —literacy, 96, 97.
 ARMENISN, 27.
 — pogroms, 18.
 — in Trans-Caucasia, 18.
 ASTRAKHAN, 4.
 ATLANTIC CHARTER AND COLONIAL PEOPLES, 153.
 AZERBAIJAN, 52.
 — annexation, 10.
 — books, 109.
 — industrialisation, 123.
 BAIKAL, lake, 8, 20.
 BALTIC, 2.
 — barons, 15, 16.
 — provinces, 5, 27, 40.
 — States, 60.
 BASHKIRS, 20, 92.
 — exploitation, 21.
 — rule by native chiefs, 21.
 BATUM, 21.
 BERLIN CONFERENCE SETTLEMENT, 11.
 BESSARABIA, 5.
 BIRO-BIDJAN, 82.
 BLACK SEA STEPPES, 4.
 BOKHARA, 22.
 — women, 99.
 BOLSHEVIKS, ix, 37, 93.
 BOLSHEVIK party, viii, x.
 — clear objective conception, 47.
 BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION, x.
 BREST-LITOVSK, 43.
 BRITISH HUDSON BAY COMPANY, 7.
 BRITISH-JAPANESE ALLIANCE, 12.
 BRITISH LABOUR—bourgeois proletariat, 166.
 — defender of Empire, 165, 166.
 — share of imperialist spoils, 168.
 BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT—ineffectuality, 47.
 — attitude to Colonial Empire, 35.
 BRITISH WORKING CLASS—a warning, 175.
 BUBNOV, x.
 BUDDHISM, 20.
 BURLIAT MONGOLS, 20.
 — illiteracy, 30.
 — literacy, 94, 95.
 BURMA—constitution, 147.
 — dominion status claim, 145, 146.
 — national army, 147.
 — nationalism, 148.
 — persecution of nationalist leaders, 146.
 BYELORUSSIA, 27, 31.
 CATHERINE THE GREAT, 15.
 CATHERINE II, 4.
 CAUCASUS, 51.
 — conquest, 5.
 CENTRAL ASIA, 27, 51.
 — books, 109.
 — colonies, 11.
 — conquest, 11.
 — cultural and social backwardness, 29-30.
 — feminine emancipation, 99.
 — illiteracy, 31.

INDEX

- industry, 121.
- rebellion of 1916, 53.
- CENTRAL RUSSIA, 30.
- CHECHENS, 27.
- CHERKES, 27.
- CHINA, 9.
- British policy, 159.
- Japanese attack, 158.
- war aims, 45.
- war of national liberation, 157.
- CHINA AND SOVIET UNION, 158.
- CHINESE, 151, 152.
- CHUKCHES, 20.
- CHURCH—vested interest, 128.
- CHURCHILL, WINSTON
- imperialist, 149.
- interventionist, 48.
- CHUVASHIA — industrial develop-
ment, 125.
- CHUVASHIANS, 31.
- CIRCASSIA, 11.
- CIVIL WAR OSCILLATES, 52.
- CIVIL WAR IN COLONIAL AREAS, 53.
- CIVILISED LABOUR POLICY, 131-132.
- CLAUSEWITZ ON WAR, 45.
- CLEMENCEAU, 44.
- COLLECTIVISATION, 125-126.
- COLONIAL ATTITUDE TO WHITE
WORKERS, 131.
- COLONIAL BOURGEOISIE EXPOSED, 46.
- COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT AND WEL-
FARE FUND, 107, 172-173.
- COLONIAL NATIONALISM—HISTORIC-
ALLY PROGRESSIVE, 45.
- COLONIAL PEOPLE—BITTERNESS CON-
SEQUENCE OF OPPRESSION, 42.
- COLONIAL PEOPLES IN IMPERIALIST
WAR, 151.
- COLONIAL QUESTION IN INTER-
TIONAL POLITICS, 13.
- COLONIES—Governors' veto, 164.
- nationalist aspirations, 44, 45.
- milching ground of imperialism,
174.
- "Open Door" policy, 163.
- post-war design, 160.
- sovereignty, 162.
- COMMANDER ISLAND, 9.
- COMMUNISM—cannot be forced, 63.
- CONGO BASIN ACT, 12.
- CONSTANTINOPLE, 2.
- CORDON SANITAIRE, 44.
- COSSACKS—colonial rulers, 7, 8.
- origin, 5-6.
- COSSACKS AND OPENING UP OF
SIBERIA, 5-7.
- COSSACKS AND SIBERIA, 4.
- COSSACKS IN SIBERIA, 19.
- COTTON, 121, 122, 126.
- COUNCILS OF ACTION, 48.
- COURLAND, DUCHY OF, 4.
- COUNTER REVOLUTION ORGANISED,
48.
- CRIMEA, 4.
- CRIMEAN WAR, 10.
- CRIPPS, SIR STAFFORD, 149, 150.
- CROATS, 78, 80.
- CULTURAL RENAISSANCE, 90.
- CZARISM—education, 90.
- CZARIST IMPERIALISM—comparison
with imperialism in Africa, 25.
- no restraining democratic oppo-
sition, 25, 26.
- CZARIST RUSSIA, 1.
- CZECHOSLOVAKIA, 78.
- DAGHESTAN, 18.
- literacy, 95.
- DECLARATION OF RIGHTS OF
PEOPLES, 48.
- DENIKIN, 48, 51.
- DICTATORSHIP OF PROLETARIAT, x.
- DOLLAR DIPLOMACY, 163.
- DUTCH AND NETHERLANDS INDIES,
157.
- DZERSHINSKY, x.
- EDUCATION—adoption of vernac-
ulars, 93.
- African colonies, 100-103.
- EDUCATION IN COLONIES—commu-
nism, 106-107.
- objective, 104-105.
- racial inferiority doctrines, 103-
104.
- EMANCIPATION OF SLAVES, 60.
- EMPIRE—tory realism, 165.
- ENGELS, 33.
- on British labour and Empire,
166.
- ESTONIA, 4, 15, 43, 51.
- ETHNIC DEMOCRACY, 154-155.
- ETHNIC DIVISION OF RUSSIAN EMPIRE
14.

INDEX

- FABIAN IMPERIALISM, 170.
- FAR NORTH—literacy, 97.
- FASCISM—alternative to Socialism,
178.
- bourgeois—counter-revolution,
36.
- FEBRUARY REVOLUTION AND FIN-
LAND, 40.
- FERGHANA VALLEY, 126.
- FINLAND, 4, 39, 44, 51, 60.
- autonomy, 16.
- failure of workers' revolution,
40-41.
- German intervention, 40.
- Great Power vassal, 40-41.
- Kerensky's suppression of Diet,
40.
- Lenin's recognition, 40.
- Soviet attack, 1940, 62.
- FIVE-YEAR PLAN, 1932-37, 118, 119.
- FORCED LABOUR, 24, 25.
- FRENCH CAPITAL IN RUSSIA, 9.
- GARVEY MOVEMENT, 83-85.
- GEORGIA AND GEORGIANS, 17, 27, 52
- annexation, 10, 11.
- resistance to Russification, 17.
- GOLD COAST EDUCATION, 102.
- GOLTZ, VON DER, 40.
- GOSPLAN, 117, 118, 123.
- GREAT RUSSIA AND GREAT
RUSSIANS, 27, 92.
- chauvinism, 130-131.
- GUCHKOV, xv.
- HITLER, 78.
- and Baltic patriots, 44.
- ILLITERACY, 91.
- under reaction, 91.
- IMPERIALISM—inherent nature, 144.
- its meaning, 36.
- labour policy in Africa, 132-133.
- INDIA, 149.
- left-wing view, 151.
- problem, economic, 150.
- right to self-determination, 153-
154.
- Sargent plan for mass education,
107-108.
- Worth to Britain, 150.
- INGUSHES, 27.
- INORODTZI—"aliens by origin," 23
- INTERVENTION, 48.
- INTER-RACIAL DISCORD FOMENTED,
27.
- IRRIGATION, 127-128.
- IVAN THE TERRIBLE, 3, 4, 5.
- wars, 4.
- JAPAN AND PORT ARTHUR, 10.
- as imperialist aggressor, 160.
- JENGHIS KHAN, 5, 20.
- JEWS—comparison with segregated
Africa, 27.
- in the Soviet Union, 81-82.
- pogroms, 27.
- treatment under Czarism, 27.
- JUGOSLAVIA, 78.
- national liberation, 80.
- KAGANOVITCH, LAZARUS, 82.
- KALMUKS, 26.
- KAMCHATKA, 9.
- KARS, 11.
- KAZAN, 3.
- KAZAN TARTARS—assimilation, 21.
- KAZAKSTAN—industrialisation, 119
120.
- literacy, 95.
- press, 109.
- KENYA, 27.
- education, 101.
- KERENSKY ALEXANDER, xv, xvi, 41.
- government overthrown, xvii.
- KHIVA, 22.
- KIRGHIZIA—literacy, 95.
- KIRGHIZIANS AND KAZAKS, 6.
- flight to Sinkiang, 53.
- KOLCHAK, 48, 51.
- KOREA—Japanese sovereignty, 9.
- KORNILOV, 48.
- KRASNOV, 48.
- KUUSINEN, DR. OTTO, 85.
- puppet government, 62.
- LABOUR PARTY—bankrupt view of
imperialism, 168.
- colonial administration, 175.
- dependency on unions, 168.
- illusions of idealists, 173.
- reformist, 169.
- removal of colonial imperialism,
172, 173.

INDEX

- LABOUR'S COLONIAL THESIS, 170-172
LATVIA, 15.
LENIN, xv, xvi, xvii, xviii, 39, 48, 55.
— a tribute, 47.
— and Estonia, 43.
— against national oppression, 33.
— attitude to Finland, 41.
— conception of Bolsheviks, 34.
— Declaration of Right of self-determination, 51.
— duty of Russian workers, 85.
— Great Russian chauvinism, 92, 93.
— internationalism, 36.
— on illiteracy, 9.
— on imperialism, 36.
— on social revolution, 177.
— on war, 160.
— on women, 129.
— on 1905, 46.
— "proletarian dictatorship," 113.
— realist, 93.
— revolutionary Marxism, 34.
— right to secede, 58.
— right of self-determination, xvii.
— self-determination, 49, 61, 173.
— self-determination inviolable right, 93.
— thesis on self-determination, 37-38.
— theory and practice, 47.
— vindication of policy in Finland, 41, 42.
LENIN'S ROLE, xix.
LEZGIANS—migration to Turkey, 19
— resistance, 18.
LIBERAL "TRUSTEESHIP," 26.
LINCOLN, ABRAHAM—object of civil war not to free slaves, 60.
LITHUANIA, 15.
LIBRARIES, 108.
LITVINOV, MAXIM, 82.
LIVONIA, 4.
LLOYD GEORGE, 44.
LOSOWSKY, ALEXANDER, 82.
LUXEMBOURG, ROSA, 39.
LVOV, PRINCE, vii.
MACEDONIA, 80.
MALAYA, 139, 140.
— illegality of political organisation, 141.
— Mui Tsai (child slavery), 141-143.
— native attitude to war, 145.
— pukka sahibs, 145, 146.
— Selangor strike, 140, 141.
— wages, 140.
MAMONTOV, 48.
MANCHURIA, 2, 9, 10.
MANDATES SYSTEM, 161, 162.
MANNERHEIM, BARON GENERAL, 40.
MARITIME PROVINCE, 2, 9.
MARIYS, 31.
MARX, 33.
MARKISM v. REFORMISM, 168.
MENSHEVIKS, xvi.
MILYUKOV, xv.
MILITARY REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEE, xvii.
MULTI-NATIONAL STATE—a political instrument, 113.
MURMANSK, 51.
NATIONAL AND COLONIAL QUESTION, xiv.
— its importance, 36-37.
NATIONAL BACKWARDNESS HISTORICALLY CONDITIONED, 93.
NATIONAL CULTURE, 111-112.
NATIONAL MINORITIES—percentage of organised workers, 130.
NATIONALISM, 79.
— importance of language, 89-90.
— bourgeois form, 44, 45.
— in modern Europe, 81.
NEGRO SEPARATISM, 83.
NICHOLAS I, 5.
NICHOLAS II, 10.
NOMADS, 128.
NORTH PACIFIC EXPANSION, 9.
NORTH SAKHALIN, 9.
NORTHERN ASIA—Russian penetration, 5.
OBI RIVER, 5.
OBJECT OF WAR—American opinion, 157.
OCTOBER REVOLUTION, xiv, 47.
OCTOBRISTS, xv.
ORTHODOX CHURCH, 15.
— its role in Russia, 28, 29.
OSTIAKS, 20.

INDEX

- OTTOMAN EMPIRE, 4.
OUTER MONGOLIA CEDED, 12.
PALESTINE PROBLEM, 84.
PAUL, CZAR, 8, 17.
PERSIA, 3, 5.
PETER THE GREAT, 4, 9, 15.
PHILIPPINES, 164.
— annexation by America, 9.
PILSUDSKI, 61.
POLAND, 4, 5, 27, 39, 44, 60.
POLISH PARTITION, 15.
POLISH REBELLION, 15.
POPULATION—distribution of workers, 114, 115.
PORT ARTHUR SECURED, 10.
PRESS, 31.
PROLETARIANISATION, 115-116.
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN U.S.A., 169.
RED ARMY, 52, 62.
— racial equality, 67-68.
REGIONAL COUNCIL—association of natives, 165.
REGIONALISM, 162, 162, 177.
RELIGIOUS SECTS, 28.
RHODES, CECIL—on empire, 166.
RIGHT OF SECESSION, 58.
RUSSIA AND ABYSSINIA, 12.
— and Britain's policy, 12.
— and Ottoman Empire, 10.
— borders, 2.
— Central Asian Colonies, 2.
— foreign financial exploitation, 1-2.
— Provisional Government, xv, xvi
— racial inhabitants, 2.
RUSSIAN EMPIRE—administrative divisions, 14-15.
RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM IN CENTRAL ASIA, 23-24.
RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—its course, 51.
RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY—1903 Conference, 34.
RUSSIFICATION, 30.
RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR, 3.
— outbreak, 10.
RUSSO-TURKISH WAR, 11.
SAMOYEDS, 20.
ST. PETERSBURG, 4.
SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE, 159.
— open hostility of Big Three, 176.
SAN STEFANO TREATY, 12.
SELF-DETERMINATION, 39, 44, 46, 55.
— aid to Soviet power, 55.
— and a Socialist Britain, 63.
— and Great Russian chauvinism, 92-93.
— and social-imperialists, 151.
— British left standpoint, 93.
— consequences of negation to Spanish, 54.
— fundamental right, 151.
— indivisible right, 152.
— Left-wing fallacy, 151, 152.
— Leninist and Wilsonian conceptions, 77-78.
— necessary adjunct to social emancipation of metropolis 35.
— practical interpretation, 113.
SERBS, 28, 30.
SERF EMANCIPATION IN BALTIC, 16.
SHAMANISM, 20.
SIBIR OR ISKER, 5.
SIBERIA, 2, 3, 5, 6, 19, 25.
— administrative divisions, 20.
— banishment, 19.
— fur collecting tribes, 19-20.
— colonising settlers, 8.
— exile policy, 8.
— immigration, 19.
— settlement, 19.
SIBIRIANS, 19.
SIERRA LEONE—education, 101, 102
SINGAPORE, 143.
— Legislative Council, 143.
— native apathy, 143, 144.
— opium monopoly, 146.
SINO-JAPANESE WAR, 10.
SLOVAKS, 78.
SMUSHKEVITZ, LIEUT.-GEN. JACOB, 82.
SMUTS, MARSHAL, AND MANDATES, 161.
— and Regionalism, 162.
SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARIES, xvii.
SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENTS, 51.

INDEX

- SOVIET ASIA—cultural resurgence, 109-111.
— women, 129.
- SOVIET DECLARATION TO SUBJECT PEOPLES, 50.
- SOVIET DEMOCRACY—its defects, 133
- SOVIET EAST—emancipation of women, 98.
— industrialisation, 123, 124.
— Russian allies, 153.
- SOVIET EDUCATION—objective, 103.
- SOVIET-ESTONIA TREATY, 43.
- SOVIET-LATVIA TREATY, 43.
- SOVIET-LITHUANIA TREATY, 43.
- SOVIET LITERATURE, 110.
- SOVIET MANIFESTO, 61.
- SOVIET MULTI-NATIONAL STATE, 178.
- SOVIET NATIONAL POLICY, 134-135.
- SOVIET OF NATIONALITIES, 70.
- SOVIET STATE—structural administration, 67.
- SOVIET UNION, 44, 60.
— a union of equal states, 59.
— a voluntary union, 58, 59.
- SOVIET UNION AND BRITISH EMPIRES— comparison of attitudes, 138, 139.
— administrative divisions, 65, 66.
— Colour Bar illegal, 87.
— comparison with rule in British Empire, 76, 77.
— democratic defects, 155.
— democracy, 75, 76.
— dual citizenship, 70.
— equality of races, 64, 65.
— expression of national minority aspirations, 77.
— flexibility of government system, 71-73.
— loss of Baltic states, 43.
— multi-national state, 86.
— political democracy, 64.
— pyramidal system, 74-75.
— representation, 69, 70.
— solution of coloured problem, 179.
— stability of state, 87.
— equality, 71.
- SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES, xv, xvii.
- SPAIN—People's Front, 54.
- STALIN, 50, 56.
- STALIN AND FINLAND, 1940, 62, 63.
- STALIN—crisis in capitalist society, 79.
— theoretician on Colonial Question, 37.
— tribute to Trotsky, xviii.
— warning, 55.
- STATE FARMS, 127.
- STROGANOV FAMILY, 5, 6.
- SUDETEN GERMANS, 78.
- SVERDLOV, xviii.
- SWEDEN, 5.
- TAJKS, 31.
- TANNER, 42.
- TARTAR RESISTANCE, 7.
- TARTARIA, 31.
- TEXTILE CENTRES, 11.
- TITO, MARSHAL, 80.
— federated Yugoslavia, 79.
- TONGKING ANNEXED BY FRANCE, 9.
- TRANSBAIKALIA, 8.
- TRANS-CASPIA, 21.
- TRANS-CAUCASIA, 17, 52.
— agrarian policy, 17-18.
— race mixtures, 18.
- TRANS-SIBERIAN RAILWAY, 9, 10, 25.
- TRANSYLVANIA—national reconciliation, 80.
- TREATIES OF FRIENDSHIP, 58.
- TROTSKY, x, 51, 52, 82.
- TURKESTAN, 11, 22, 30.
— rule through Empires, 22.
- TURKESTAN-SIBERIAN RAILWAY, 120.
- TURKEY, 11.
— war with Russians, 5.
- TURKMANS, 27.
- TURKS, 6.
- UKRAINE, 5, 27.
— clergy, 15.
— protectorate, 15.
- U.S.A. AND COLONIES, 163, 164.
— example of federated state, 59.
- U.S.S.R.—Article 121 of Constitution, 93-94.
— creation of proletariat, 115.
— formation, 56, 57, 58.
— transitional problems, 113, 114.
- URALS, 8, 20.
— industrialisation, 124.

INDEX

- URITSKY, xviii.
- USSARI RIVER, 9.
- UZBEKISTAN—industrialisation, 120, 123.
— literacy, 96.
— women, 98.
- UZBEKS, 27.
- VLADIVOSTOCK, 9, 10.
- WARSAW, 61.
- WEYGAND, GENERAL, 61.
- WHITE RUSSIA, 5.
- WILLKIE, WENDELL, 165.
- WOMEN, 100.
- WORLD WAR—German needs, 158.
- WORLD WAR 2—an examination, 156, 157, 159.
- WRANGEL, 48, 51.
- YAKUT, 19.
- YAKUTS, 31.
- YAKUTIA—industrial development, 124, 125.
- YUDENITCH, GENERAL, 43, 48, 51.
- ZIONISM, 81, 82.