

What Saklatvala Symbolizes -

By William F. Dunne

ARTICLE IV.

THE Chicago Tribune with its vicious denunciation of Communists and the left wing of British labor per the quotation with which the third article of this series ended, speaks for the middle western capitalist class. Its sentiments are echoed by the New York Times, however, and the Washington Post and pretty generally by the metropolitan press as a whole. American imperialism naturally is not greatly concerned over the decay of British industry but its interests as a part of world capitalism will not allow it to contemplate the rise of the British working class with anything but fear and hatred.

JUST at present American imperialism is striving at Locarno for an agreement among the foremost European capitalist powers that will further stabilization of industry and credit. The proposed visit of Saklatvala would have injected a jarring note into the, on the surface, amicable relations between America and Great Britain.

The Dawes plan was the first step towards this stabilization but without political guarantees it cannot make for any kind of permanency. It is only now that the workers of Germany, Holland and Switzerland are beginning to understand clearly that the Dawes plan is a slave plan. In Germany already it has lengthened the working week in practice from 48 to 51 hours, in Holland to 50½ hours, in Switzerland to 52. In all these cases the lengthening of hours has been accompanied either by a reduction in money wages, in real wages or both. The workers are rallying again, urged on by bitter need.

SAKLATVALA could and would not have spoken about the oppression of the Indian workers without pointing out the world wide character of imperialism and its ceaseless attacks on the workers of all countries.

He would have told us, for instance, of the statements of N. M. Joshi, representative of Indian labor at Geneva, before the Indian legislature:

If there is a hell on earth it is in the city of Bombay . . . of the 150,000 mill hands in Bombay 95 per cent live in one room dwellings.

According to the figures published by the labor office of Bombay the mortality of children under one year of age in these tenements is 828.5 per thousand. Children are born there only to die.

The correspondent of the London Daily Herald who gives this report states that Joshi's statements "were greeted with laughter"—by the representatives of British and Indian capital. He adds:

Thus the government and the capitalists, both European and Indian,

were united against the bill (a bill granting government aid to working mothers—W. F. D.) which was defeated, in spite of Mr. Joshi's moving speech.

THE 150,000 mill hands mentioned are on strike as this is written and British imperialism is delighting in another terroristic orgy with the strikers as the victims.

But Saklatvala would not have spoken of the terrible conditions among his people without speaking of the anti-imperialist spirit—that tremendous new development in Great Britain—among the British working class in spite of their middle class leaders. Saklatvala is a Communist and he would have related the refusal of MacDonald, who, when in the office of premier, wrote to the Indian people the most cold-blooded and threatening letter ever sent by a British government, to form a united front with the Communists against British imperialism and who opposes world trade union unity with the same arguments used by Baldwin.

MACDONALD says that if the British labor party were "to toy with revolution it would rightly forfeit the confidence of all who had heads to think and minds to control action," but Britain faces a revolutionary situation and refusal to prepare the working class for it is support of the imperialists.

Ramsay MacDonald does not like Saklatvala because Saklatvala is for the destruction of the slaveholding British empire and it is noticeable that the American press, in dealing with the Saklatvala controversy and the swing of British labor to the left, is careful to speak kindly of the MacDonaldites in the labor party.

SAKLATVALA might have quoted Lord Parmoor on British war expenditures, a substantial portion of which is for the purpose of equipping the colonial punitive expeditions and armies of occupation which British imperialism maintains in Africa, Egypt, China and India. Said Lord Parmoor on Sept. 25 in an interview to the press:

For expenditure, on past wars and to provide for future was, Great Britain is staggering under the annual charge of 540,000,000 pounds. How can constancy of industrial prosperity be expected under such a burden? Now comes the threat of war with Turkey, which cannot be dissociated from the general questions that arise between the East and West.

LORD PARMOOR did not but Saklatvala would have pointed out the real basis of "the general questions which arise between the East and West" is the robbery of the workers and peasants of the East by the imperialists of the West.

Britain's attempt to grab the oil deposits of Mosul and enslave the Mohammedan tribesmen there cannot be separated from "the general questions that arise between the East and West." In Mosul is another danger spot for British imperialism and Saklatvala would have said—and truly—that the Mosul question is not entirely a matter of oil. If Turkey gets Mosul she will get Mesopotamia and the British land route to India will be cut in two.

No, in this day and age, when there are revolts of colonial peoples from the Riff to Shanghai and when the beginning of a liberation movement can be discerned even in America's precious Philippines, imperialism, whether it be British or American, wants no Saklatvala running at large. BUT the closest-knit unity between

America and Great Britain is found in their actions towards the Soviet Union. It is so obvious that it seems scarcely necessary to call attention to it. It is fear of working class support of the workers' and peasants' government of Russia that drives the imperialists to such open violations of their bourgeois-democratic legalities as the exclusion of Saklatvala.

This is to be found in the attitude of the American capitalist press towards Purcell. He was treated as any other fraternal delegate to an A. F. of L. convention until he urged world trade union unity with the All-Russian unions as integral part of the trade union international. Then the floodgates of capitalist wrath were opened and beginning with President Green every toady of Wall Street has denounced him as "an enemy of labor and society." American imperialism is never so righteously indignant as when it finds someone trying to teach its hand-fed labor movement a little class consciousness and if in addition to this the offender speaks a good word for the Soviet Union, he must be cast into the outer darkness.

THIS is, in fact, exactly what the Washington Post proposes to do with Purcell. In a recent issue it has this and more to say of the chairman of the International Federation of Trade Unions:

Purcell is an advocate of world revolution. He represents the agitators who have led so many British workmen into the toils of Communism. Whether Purcell is wittingly an agent of Moscow or whether he is merely a tool of the destroyers of organized labor does not appear, but his own writings show that he is working to stir up a world revolution for the overthrow of organized governments. In the August number of Trade Union Unity, of which he is joint editor, he wrote:

There is only one solution to the problem of war, just as there is only one way to secure a universal one-hour day, to say nothing of the six-hour day that may be possible when industry is controlled by the workers. The way is the positive militant international unity of the organized working class, consciously directed to the overthrow of capitalism. In that way alone can we defeat ourselves against capitalism's present world offensive.

These are the words of Lenin and Trotsky, repeated by Purcell. What is this Communist doing at a meeting of the American Federation of Labor? How did he smuggle himself into the United States in violation of the law excluding Communists and agitators of Communist doctrines? What is the bureau of immigration doing that it permits a Communist to violate the act of June 5, 1920? What about it, Mr. Commissioner General Hull?

GREEN, since his attack on Purcell, has become the angel with the flaming sword guarding the Eden of American capitalism.

Purcell is not a Communist but he is a fighter for "the positive militant international unity of the organized working class consciously directed to the overthrow of capitalism."

He too is a danger to British and American imperialism but he is not a Communist like Saklatvala. Moreover, even British imperialists are not yet desperate enough to brave the storm his exclusion would have aroused. Had he said no word in favor of the Soviet Republics and the unions which are its foundation, he would have been left to go his way in peace.

WE have said before that Saklatvala and Purcell in America at the same time was more than British and American imperialism could stomach. They want no such exposures from the lips of a colonial subject in America as is contained in Lansbury's Sunday Worker for September 27, while the chairman of the Amsterdam International urges unity with the Russian unions from the platform of an A. F. of L. convention. British imperialism still has work for Ramsay MacDonald to do and it does not want his usefulness in misleading both American and British worker destroyed.

SAKLATVALA would probably have told his audiences of the agreement entered into with Bulgaria against Soviet Russia by MacDonald while occupying, as a representative of the workers, the office that Baldwin now holds. The following quotation from the Sunday Worker, contained in a story vouched for by its correspondent, sheds a glaring light on the efforts to keep out of the Unit-

ed States a friend of the Soviet Union against which every British government, including the MacDonald government, has plotted with American assistance:

In September, 1924, Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, labor prime minister of Great Britain, was the chief British delegate to the league of nations assembly at Geneva. A representative of the Bulgarian government was also present, and he sought the opportunity of a private conversation with Mr. MacDonald. It is now possible to reveal the impressions which Mr. MacDonald gave to that representative.

At the outset, despite the fact that the Zankov government had come into power by the murder of Stambolisky, that murders of its political opponents were even then almost a daily occurrence, the labor prime minister was expansive towards Zankov's representative. The British labor government, he said, was disposed to come to an agreement with Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian delegate had put forward some of Bulgaria's demands, such as an outlet on the Aegean Sea, a settlement of the minorities and reparations questions, and a larger army.

Then he turned to the "Bolshevik peril," on which subject the Bulgarian delegate had been skillfully insistent. The British labor prime minister assured the representative of the Zankov government of his personal support, and that of his cabinet, in the fight against this "Bolshevik peril." He explained that it was the object of the British government to build a barrier between Soviet Russia and the rest of Europe.

Therefore, a few weeks afterwards, Kalfoff was able to assure the Bulgarian cabinet of British support, and to urge that it should go confidently forward with its campaign of repression by imprisonment and murder of the Communists and should keep up its demands on the allies for a larger army.

It was not until after the Sofia bomb affair, last April, that the permission for a larger army was given, temporarily, and it is true that Mr. Austen Chamberlain was then at the foreign office. But the encouragement to Zankov to continue on his bloody path, which led to those horrors of the spring and summer, was given directly from the mouth of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald.

And it was given in order that this butcher Zankov might be used as the tool for preparing "a barrier against the workers' republic of Russia." That was the deed of Britain's first labor prime minister.

(To be continued.)