 Left British Social Democrats as Defenders of Imperialism.

By M. N. Roy (Moscow).

The British Labour movement, which is being carried on with great Britain are intended to provide a more stable basis for this civil peace. They are anything but favourable to the Egyptian claims to independence or to the broad masses of the Egyptian people; indeed, so far as is known, the proposals which Chamberlain submitted to the Egyptian Prime Minister Sarvat Pasha exclude the Liberal-Constitutional Party in itself very well, for the continuation of the disputed rule of Great Britain in the Sudan is confirmed, to the greatest disadvantage of Egypt. The British troops are possibly to be evacuated from the interior of Egypt, but are to be placed in strategic positions, presumably close to the Suez Canal. A treaty of alliance is to be concluded between Egypt and Great Britain, which the latter will be able to cancel quite easily and the former not at all.

The British, however, know very well, why they can now confront the Egyptian Government with such presumptuous demands, which still fail short of the suggestions made three years ago and even, in many details, of the recently concluded agreement with the last Bourbon Government, Bruneau's treaty. They manoeuvre among the various Egyptian parties, each of which would be glad to undertake the execution of the agreement. In the first place this naturally applies to the Ittehidists, the party in closest touch with the Court, but it is also true of the Liberal-Constitutionalists, represented by the present Prime Minister, Sarvat Pasha, and, last not least, of the Wald itself. The longer the "bidding" for the agreement with the British Government lasts, the more favourable the situation will be for the British policy.

Before all, the British policy can reckon on the increasing friction within the coalition formed by the Liberals and the Wald. If, however, the Wald succeeds (as its leaders and in particular its new President, Mustapha Nehas, aim to do) in arriving, parallel with the official negotiations, at an understanding with the King and also with the British Resident, the Liberal-Constitutionalists can be eliminated and the Wald will assume power alone.

To anticipate this elimination, Sarvat Pasha is endeavouring to accelerate the outbreak of differences between his own party and the Wald. If he succeeds in this purpose, he will be saved. If the Wald succeeds, the Wald would again be obliged to accept the conditions of coalition, by which he would take care to safeguard his own interests more than hitherto. The pressure on the part of Great Britain at the negotiations, the efforts of the Wald to seize the authority, and the counter-maneuvers of Sarvat Pasha, are the main reasons of the Cabinet crisis at present threatening Egypt.

Both the Liberal-Constitutionalists and the Wald leaders, however, are hampered in the liberty of their movements by a considerable pressure from below. Thus just at the moment when the Liberals began to oppose the Wald, Mohammed Pasha Mahmoud, a representative of the Liberal-Constitutional Party in the Senate, published a declaration of support for the Wald in the press of that party, which is looked upon as a signal for the formation of a Left wing among the Liberal-Constitutionalists.

Yet a more serious matter is the crisis within the Wald. Here the more radically inclined members (members from those who occupy good positions in the service of the party) are wholly dissatisfied with the compromising policy of their leaders, and in the students' clubs the prospects of a split are openly discussed. The radical wing is beginning to rally round the National (Vatanist) Party, which, despite of a weakness of numbers, is lifted up in its opposition to compromise agreements, to say nothing of an attack upon Great Britain. Here, too, there are vacillations as regards orientation, towards the "intellectuals" or the peasants and workers but in most questions the radical tendency has the upper hand.

In general the internal changes in the grouping of the parties ensue rapidly enough, and the apparent "peace" and "harmony" of the Coalition in Egypt are likely to be of short duration.

In the December 30 issue, of "The New Leader" Mr. Brailsford makes a review of the past "Year of Perils and Escapes". Of course he could not do it without touching the Chinese question. After a very cursory and remarkably detached review of the situation in China, he gets terrified by a "problem of Chinese civilization", and concludes: "...the problem and a continuous struggle against imperialist and imperialism which may involve India". The "escape" from this "peril" he finds in "a rare degree of liberal foresight". So, out of the capitalist ruins and danger of imperialist war the world can only be saved not by Socialism, but by liberalism. This is the remedy prescribed by the "left wing" of the political Labour movement.

How does Mr. Brailsford, who calls himself a Socialist and passes as a "left winger" arrive at such a flagrantly un-socialist, nay anti-socialist, conclusion? He is driven to this conclusion by the fear of Socialism: by the fear that the oppressed peoples of the East will be completely convinced that their only friend is the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Mr. Brailsford invokes here a "twin idea", a liberal policy in China and a liberal policy in India alike which will assure their awakening masses that there is hope for them in quarters other than Russia, and in measures less violent than revolutionary.

The world is unavoidably heading towards Socialism and the road leads through revolution. This is the consequence of capitalism. But the Socialism of Mr. Brailsford results in seeing the inevitable logic of events and becomes a wise counsellor of imperialism in distress. The world is in revolt against capitalism. The Russian Revolution as well as the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies are the expressions of this revolt. The place where the revolt has been successful naturally becomes the standard to which the eyes of all rebels turn. Mr. Brailsford advises the imperialist rulers to adopt a liberal policy in order to break this revolutionary unity brought about by community of interests.

The hope of the awakening masses of India and China, indeed of all the subject countries is to be free from imperialist domination as a step towards the liberation from capitalist exploitation. The hope of the awakening masses of India and China can be realised without breaking the bonds of imperialism? Does he maintain that even the elementary conditions for the realisation of this hope can be created under the benign protection of imperialism? No policy of imperialism, however liberalised, can allow the realisation of this hope. Imperialism and the aspirations of the peoples it oppresses are irreconcilably antagonistic. Obviously Mr. Brailsford has a different notion as regards what he calls the hope of the colonial oppressed masses. He did not say what is it. But judging from the trend of his arguments one could gather that in his opinion the hope of the colonial peoples is not, rather should not, be national and social freedom. In that case they could secure the patronage of the liberal apologists of imperialism. But even this is not possible, as has been proved by the recent refusal of the British labour leaders to support even the most modest hope of the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie. This Mr. Brailsford himself admits when he deplores that: "the decision over the Indian Commission does not encourage optimism". So it has become clear that no other way than that of revolutionary Socialism can help the oppressed peoples realise their hope. Nevertheless, Mr. Brailsford's faith in liberalism is patently incorrigible. If it were only Mr. Brailsford's inability to grasp the situation, he could be left alone in his faith in liberalism and pacifism. But the case is, more serious. He is worried about the perilous position of liberal imperialism and is anxious to show it a way out. The "escape" he finds is not serious. However, it is significant that he is so concerned about the future of imperialism. Imperialism would not accept the advice of its Social Democratic apologists. It refuses to follow any other policy in the colonies than that of the iron hand. In this situation Social Democratic Imperialism stands completely exposed in its native character: it smears unconditionally imperialist absolutism in the colonies. Mr. Brailsford's party has
Hearst press as having been given by “Joseph Stalin” to a certain Hermann Godfrey “the representative of a whole number of Austrian and German papers”. It should be pointed out that there was never any “representative” of the name of Hermann Godfrey in Moscow.

On another occasion, “Joseph Stalin” was served up with the dressing of a “report of a secret session of the Moscow Presidency” under the very tasty heading, “The Understanding with the Holy Russian Church is the Greatest Diplomatic Achievement of the Soviets, says Joseph Stalin.” The Hearst press copied this forgery under the following blatant title: “Joseph Stalin says Russia will soon Command the Skies.”

The “World-Wide News Service”, however, is not content with the numerous forgeries published in a thousand different Hearst papers, but announces publicly that in the near future a whole series of articles will follow, including an alleged contribution by Stalin entitled “The Devolution of the Russian Woman in Present Times” and another professedly by Bukharin, under the heading “Soviet Russia’s Gamble in Naphtha.”

Our intervention in the conflict between Poland and Lithuania, which made the peaceful aims of the Soviet Union apparent to all the world, and the step undertaken by the Soviet delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference by the suggestion of a general disarmament have not only ensured us the