

LASKI'S MISTAKE

The Labour Party Executive commissioned Professor Laski to state its case against Communist Affiliation. Having no case, the Professor distorted a speech by Dimitrov.

Dimitrov's speech in full

Foreword by Harry Pollitt 1946

Twopence

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



FOREWORD

IT is well known in political circles that Professor Laski is trying to work his passage home into the good graces of Transport House, so that his turn of office as Chairman of the Labour Party may end in a blaze of anti-Communist glory.

Why is this unprincipled campaign against our affiliation to the Labour Party organised? Because of the tremendous support which Communist affiliation has won in the Labour and trade union movement. The right-wing Labour leaders know that the great trade unions which founded the Labour Party are on record in favour of Communist affiliation, with many hundreds of local organisations in support. They have seen anti-Communist bans in the British trade union movement, such as the notorious Black Circular forbidding Communists to hold office in trades councils, defeated by decision of the Trades Union Congress. They have seen recent election results, and they are very much afraid that the Labour Party Conference also will reveal strong support for Communist affiliation. This they will try to prevent at any price.

That is why every device and deceit is being tried to muddle and confuse the issue, and every kind of personal pressure is being used.

The Laskis are not only prepared to go to any lengths to prevent unity of the British Labour movement. They have placed themselves at the head of all the reactionary forces trying to break up the working-class unity against Fascism which was forged throughout Europe during the war.

Let us note how Dimitrov's speech first received prominence in Britain. It was in the newspaper of a notorious enemy of the working class, *The Sunday Dispatch*, on March 10, 1946, in an article written by one, Alastair Forbes. The interesting thing about this article is that immediately after misquoting Dimitrov, the writer delivered himself of the following pearl of wisdom:

"It is well to remember this when men so little English as Mr. Zilliacus demand a 'Little England' policy at this time in speeches not without interest for the Home Secretary."

The *Manchester Guardian*, on March 28, then took up Dimitrov's speech and, also attacking Dimitrov, used his speech to implore the Labour Party to have nothing to do with the Communist Party. Its editorial contained the following warning:

"For the Labour Party to admit the Communists would be to invite political disruption. The international repercussions too, would be great. The United States would write us off as lost and the friends of democracy (Western version) throughout Europe would give up hope."

Then at last, on April 9 to be precise, the *Daily Herald* published a review of a new pamphlet by Professor Harold Laski, on "What the Communists are After." Of course, what the Communists are really after is one thing, and what Laski shamelessly says they are after is quite another.

The object of the manoeuvre is obvious enough. It is to distract people's minds from the real issues that they know about from their own experience by bringing in something that sounds new, sinister and secret. So when Laski writes on "What the Communists are After," he relies on distorting the words of Dimitrov.

Who is this Dimitrov? He is best known as the Bulgarian Communist leader whom the Nazis tried to "frame" in connection with the burning of the Reichstag in 1933; the man whose magnificent defence at the Reichstag fire trial put the Nazis themselves in the dock before the whole world and inspired and rallied millions to the fight against Fascism. Today, after long years of exile, he is back in his native country, at last released from Fascism.

I do not want to set Dimitrov's record against Laski's as the argument for accepting Communist affiliation in Britain. The British Communist Party can stand on its own feet. But I do ask the reader to note the way Laski's whole approach appeals to "anti-foreigner" prejudice—just as Beaverbrook in his election tactics tried to create the same prejudice about Laski. This is a dirty, dangerous weapon for the British Labour Party to play with, even if it were not used in such a thoroughly bad cause.

You have now the opportunity to read what Dimitrov really said in his speech to the Communists of Bulgaria, and I ask any unprejudiced reader to point to a single sentence in this speech which bears out the following statement made by Laski in the *Daily Herald* of April 9:

"Under the guise of yearning for unity, Dimitrov avers without hesitation that the Communist aim is to stab the Social Democratic Parties in the back."

It is not in the best tradition of British political pamphleteering to place your own reactionary thoughts in the mouths of

political opponents whom intellectually you know you cannot answer. But when Laski tries this method on with a man like Dimitrov, then, if I may borrow Harold's favourite Dickensian phrase, it is time "to humbly protest."

HARRY POLLITT

DIMITROV'S SPEECH

TO THE WORKERS' PARTY CONGRESS, SOFIA, FEBRUARY 27, 1946

(Monitored by the B.B.C. from Belgrade on March 3)

COMRADES, MEN AND WOMEN!

As a party of the working class, a party of Marxists, we differ essentially from many other political parties. There are political parties which exist for a certain time; they are set up to realise certain aims, and as soon as they have fulfilled them they disappear. Our party is not like that. It can be said that it is an historic party. It arose in the struggle; it developed and grew in a constant struggle.

From its beginning and up to today, our party has been in existence without any sort of a break for 50 years. It must continue to exist and will exist until the historic moment when Communism, the Communist Society, will be realised perfectly and then every political party will, of course, become superfluous.

Until that moment, the party must be capable of discharging the task which faces it at each stage of social development. When Communism has prevailed completely the party will merge with the nation and the nation with the Communist Society; then it will have discharged its historic task.

But because our party has such a character and such an historic task, it must be different from other, temporary political parties by its internal constitution, by its discipline, and by the standard of its ideology. Apart from that, since September 9, our Party as you know, has grown into a tremendous mass party, to suit our Bulgarian conditions. Many new elements have joined its ranks, workers and peasants, tradesmen, intellectuals, scientists, artists.

Our party has received many devoted and honourable elements from the people. But alongside with this you know very well that as the leading party we gained such a power of attraction such as we had been unable to have before September 9.

Until September 9, those who were members of the party

were prepared to sacrifice their material interests, their personal convenience, nay their very lives. After September 9 the party was joined by a certain number of casual elements and by elements alien to the Communist Party, among them those seeking protection against certain inconveniences in connection with their activities in the past, others being concerned for their personal interests, for the securing of positions which they might exploit for their benefits and the benefit of their relations.

These people even proclaimed themselves the most zealous "first class" Communists.

We must say openly that in our party which has over 400,000 members, there are also elements who do not deserve to be in it, there are elements who have to be purged as being alien and harmful to us and liable to compromise the party.

If we want the party to be a party with an historic mission, if we want our party to maintain itself and to attain success in its faithful service of the people, if we want Communism to prevail completely, there can be no place in our ranks for careerists; there can be no room for people who are availing themselves of authority for their personal interests. There must be no corruption, nothing which might compromise our party.

Comrades, men and women, severity is indispensable here, ruthless severity.

By it, we cannot lose as a party, we can only gain. Let there not be 450,000 members of the party, let there be 400,000 of them, but those 400,000 honourable champions of the nation's cause.

These 400,000 honourable fighters for the cause of the Fatherland Front and the cause of Socialism are capable of leading millions of Bulgarian men and women into the future.

The party must also have an iron—a conscious and voluntary but still iron, discipline which is based and must be based on our unanimity, on our common tasks and objects, on our Marxist teachings.

Such unanimity and discipline are essential if our Party is to accomplish its historic task. Hence it emerges that personal wishes, interests and conceptions cannot be placed above the tasks and objects of the party. That which is personal in us regardless of the rank we hold, must be subordinated to the interests of the party and the interests of the people.

From this, it further emerges that in our party organisations

and in the party as a whole there can be no place for any groups or sections, for any hostile anti-party nests.

Where such nests appear, they must be purged mercilessly. If necessary the party surgical knife must be used. No patience or toleration must exist towards such elements in the party as attempt to disorganise its ranks, introduce demoralisation or preach alien hostile ideas and influences. This, comrades is all the more essential in view of the fact that there are a good number of members in the party who are new, who are not well acquainted with our history, who have not completely assimilated the general Fatherland Front Line of the party, who may submit to the influence of demagogy and misguidance from outside, become the victims of provocateurs and agents of our enemies.

Our enemies cannot break our party by a frontal attack from outside because it rests on a rocklike basis. However, they are trying by various slogans and demagogical phrases to mislead individual members of our party, to introduce disorganisation into its ranks, to weaken its discipline and ideological political unity from inside.

Such elements in the party must be watched. Merciless action must be taken against such elements which disorganise and demoralise the party. In a militant party such as ours there can be no place for anarchists, anarcho-syndicalists, anarcho-Communists and similar harmful elements.

The unity, discipline and fighting capacity of the party depend above all on two important factors: first, the party cadres; secondly, the correct conception of the party line and its perspectives; whither we are going; what we are fighting for and what we wish to reach as a party and as a people.

As regards the party cadres, we often hear talk of "old" and "young" cadres. Old and young! This is a completely mistaken view. The party has several categories of cadres: we may say four basic categories, but in each one of them there are both old and young. One category consists of cadres—old and young—who were in the ranks of the party before September 9, some even before 1923, others later, but all inside the party without a break until September 9, where they fought actively against fascism, took part in the historic work of September 9, and after September 9, continued constantly, honourably, loyally to serve the party.

That is the first category. The second category—also both old and young, consists of those who before September 9, some since 1923, others later, were not active fighters of our party, remained outside, but helped the party in its work in towns and villages in accordance with their powers and opportunities. These are honourable and devoted people, but they are not heroes; they are incapable of joining the partisan detachments and are not prepared to go to the Central Prison or the concentration camp. They held aloof but sincerely supported the party, tried to help it morally and materially, concealed our illegal comrades, helped various fighters, etc. That is the second category.

There is also a special category of party cadres, both old and young, who, during the fascist regime and until September 9, separated themselves from the party, were passive, held aloof and considered their own personal interests (some were lawyers, many teachers, many officials, etc.), but who did not adopt a hostile attitude towards the party, did not go over to the enemy and did not help fascism.

That is the third category of our party cadres.

Finally we have our new party cadres—both old and young in years. These appeared and grew up after September 9 when the portals of political activity opened wide, when the skies cleared and when incessant cheers resounded everywhere. That is when they began their political activity in the party and when they sprang up as new party cadres in the state machine, in the social organisations, in the Fatherland Front, etc. That is the fourth category of party cadres.

These are the four basic categories of our party. The party is concerned with the rational exploitation of all these ranks in party activities or in the state apparatus, the social organisations and everywhere in the nation for the organisation of the new Fatherland Front, Bulgaria.

For this reason, all the individual elements of these four categories must have the close attention of party leaders everywhere. Our task, in the period through which we are going, is the early merging of all these four categories into one whole, into our party organisation, upon which the unity, discipline and fighting qualities of our party largely depend.

It is, however, natural that the party cannot adopt the same attitude towards all four categories. There are differences. The central, regional and district leading bodies of the party must

consist above all of men of the first category. The first category is the very backbone of the party. These are the ranks which offer the best and most complete guarantee for the correct guidance of the party and the correct education of the party masses. After that comes the second category of people who have helped the party in the struggle against fascism.

One cannot but adopt a certain reserve towards the third category. This category consists of people who have not aided the party but who have not gone over to the side of the enemy either. For a long period, in some cases for as much as 20 years, they have been separated from political life, from the party and from its struggle. Accordingly this category has remained behind, politically and ideologically.

They cannot now aspire to leading positions in the party. They must make up for what they have omitted before being able to pretend to a decisive participation in party counsels.

This category can and will be useful in the state apparatus, in the social organisations, but only under the guidance of the party. By their knowledge the men of this category who are lawyers, physicians, engineers and other specialists, will be useful as far as they comply with the directives of the party, of the party leaders, in as far as they submit to the strict party discipline. In this category, there are comrades of ours who feel embittered. Some of them were leaders of regional or district organisations before 1923, some were even members of the Central Committee, national deputies, municipal councillors, until September 23, 1923, and now, when they have come again to the surface in the free political atmosphere, they think that they should certainly occupy leading positions in the party, the state, the municipality and so on.

This produces a certain amount of friction for the party organisations, and an end must be made to it. These comrades of ours must be aware that they can only occupy leading positions in the life of the party and responsible positions in our state and social life if they roll up their sleeves, put their shoulders to the wheel and if they submit to party leadership and party discipline. On the other hand the party must help them in every respect to enable them to make up as soon as possible for what they have omitted in the past.

Here it must be said that in certain quarters very often an incorrect attitude prevails towards this category. Some party

leaders say:—"We have been fighting, we have been making sacrifices, and they have looked after their offices, their vineyards, and their convenience, they have never committed themselves but have guarded their skins. Now they want to be leaders, regional directors, district chiefs or regional leaders in the party organisation. How can that be tolerated?"

There is even a certain bitterness against them. Such an attitude is not in the interests of the party. An end must be made to it. On the contrary, it is essential to exploit the capacities and knowledge of these men fully and in the appropriate way for the cause of the party and the Fatherland Front.

With regard to the fourth category, they must take pains to master the experience of the party from the period preceding September 9 and acquaint themselves with the basic doctrines of its theory.

They must bestow particular attention upon raising their ideological and political level in order to become staunch party men.

All of us, starting from me, down to the last member of the party, must learn to guide. We were not the leading party, but an opposition party before. We were criticising and fighting them, but we did not rule, except temporarily in some municipalities until 1923.

After September 9 we have been gaining experience as the leading party. This experience is essential for us. Our party cadres, wherever they may be, must learn. All of us must learn to administer and to build together with our allies in the Fatherland Front and to learn to work jointly with them. Wherever there are any kind of competitions between us and our allies we must be in a position to supply the best experts so that our cadres are always in the first place and justify the confidence which is given to them. That is why work, knowledge and skill are essential.

There must be no indolence or self-satisfaction. We must not rest on our laurels, but we must learn to work untiringly. If somebody is an engineer, he must perfect himself; if he is an administrator he must increase his qualifications; if he is a teacher, he must do the same; and if he is a party worker, even more.

Wherever we may be, we must learn indefatigably, because if

we administer and build up our democratic Bulgaria without this knowledge, we shall be unable to assure our Fatherland and our people progress and a brighter future.

I am convinced that these questions of cadres and their education were considered with attention at the conference, but I should like to emphasise our Marxist-Leninist teachers about which, unfortunately, relatively little has been said in our party. This educational work must always be directly bound up with practice, with the creative work, with activity in the party and outside.

The separation of theory from practice is harmful. There must be harmony between the practical work we do and our theoretical teachings. We must not think that we have already reached the pinnacle of knowledge. In his sphere nobody knows as much as he could know. We must learn in the process of work, in the same way as we have learnt since September 9 in the process of the struggle against our enemy, in the concentration camps, and partisan detachments. Now, we must learn in the process of reconstruction and creation.

The second factor on which the unity, fighting capacity and discipline of the party depend is a correct appreciation of our general line and policy.

We often hear voices (they are usually provocative voices but they influence unfavourably some of our politically immature comrades) say that our party as the main force in the Fatherland Front has become an ordinary democratic party, that it has renounced Socialism, and that there is supposed to be a contradiction between the struggle and the work for the implementation for the Fatherland Front programme and the struggle for Socialism.

We must get rid of this conception. As long as there is any shilly-shallying among some of our comrades on these fundamental questions they cannot work for the party with all their energies and enthusiasm or for the common popular work of the Fatherland Front.

What, concretely, is our policy at this stage of social development, that is in the Fatherland Front era? It can be briefly outlined as follows:

From the point of view of our party, as the party of the working class and the working people, it is now and in future the complete implementation of the Fatherland Front programme, the creation of those essential conditions which will

make it possible for our people to go over to Socialism. It is, after all, known that the future of nations lies in the creation of Socialism.

However, the struggle for Socialism is different now from what it was in 1917 and 1918 in Tsarist Russia, when the October Revolution was carried through. At that time, it was essential to overthrow Russian Tsarism and the dictatorship of the proletariat was essential for the transition to Socialism. Since that time, as you know, three decades have gone, and the Soviet Union, as a Socialist State has grown into a great world power.

In the great Patriotic War, this country of Socialism showed the greatest viability, and made the greatest contribution to the victory over fascism for the salvation of European civilisation. It was just during the war that we were given a glorious confirmation of the power and superiority of a Socialist social order.

This had had, and still has, a tremendous influence on all aspects of international developments.

As a result of the war and under the influence of the great work of the Soviet Union, a deep change has been wrought in many countries. This is the case in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Finland and Bulgaria, where this democratic revolution, this development towards progress and against the old reactionary regimes in the world, the regimes of big speculation and capital, cartels, concerns and imperialism, is taking place.

We see this development in the colonies and semi-colonies, in Indonesia and in a series of other regions. Moreover, the existence of so great a Socialist State as the Soviet Union, and the historic democratic revolution which has been taking place in many countries since the war raises the question of the creation of socialism for many countries, not as a question of the struggle of the working class for Socialism, against the remaining productive social strata in the country, but, on the contrary, as a question of the co-operation between the working class with the peasants, craftsmen, intelligentsia and the progressive strata of the people. When one day the question of a transition of the people from the present social organisation to a new Socialist order arises in this country as well, then the Communists, leaning on the people, will build a new Socialist society, not in struggle against the peasants, craftsmen and intelligentsia, but together with them.

In short, it will be the historic work of the entire people. This course of social development, comrades, may to some, appear slower than the policy of "take up your arms; hit right and left and set up your dictatorship!" However, the former course is not only possible and realistic, but it is also undoubtedly much less painful for the people.

Hence, we Communists openly state that in prevailing circumstances, we chose this very course because it is a realistic and painless road to Socialism.

That in the end both great and small nations will go over to Socialism there can be no doubt, because that is historically inevitable.

The crux of the matter, and we Marxists should know this well, is this: every nation will effect its transition to Socialism not by a mapped-out route, not exactly as in the Soviet Union, but by its own road, dependent on its historical, national, social and cultural circumstances.

Making use of the great teachings of Marx, Engels and Stalin, we Bulgarian Communists and Marxists will be in a position to find our own Bulgarian course towards Socialism. Those who speak about a contradiction between the Fatherland Front policy of a struggle for the unification of all progressive forces in the Fatherland Front, for the creation of its programme, on the one hand, and the struggle for Socialism on the other, are either not Marxists, or they are provocateurs. Every stage of social development gives the people a great central task. In our Fatherland Front era, this central task is the implementation of the Fatherland Front programme, the continuation until its victorious conclusion of the great work of September 9, the safeguarding of the Bulgarian People's democracy, in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the Bulgarian people. Therefore, all those who do not work and do not fight in the Fatherland Front ranks for the accomplishment of this great national task, however much they may declaim about Socialism, merely feed the fire of reaction and the enemies of Socialism.

Lest I take up too much of your time, comrades, just one more word: we must have, as members of the Communist Party, the noble ambition to show ourselves in every respect as good and faithful pupils of Lenin and Stalin.

In many places, the party leaders prefer to give orders

instead of establishing friendship with the party members and the population, instead of explaining patiently, of teaching and educating and of themselves learning from the masses at the same time. If you hold a conference, have a look at what sort of people are there. Raise those who are capable and gifted. Experience shows that the capable party members are as a rule modest and keep apart, whereas talkative people frequently push themselves to the fore.

Keep an eye open for such comrades who are modest and capable, like Diogenes, with the lantern, when he looked for a man! Look for activists and show the way to the capable. There are such honourable and devoted young men who, if they see that somebody more learned than they delivers a speech, think to themselves: "I shall never be able to catch up with him," although themselves capable organisers with a good deal of common sense and firm characters. I tell you that in our nation, in our party, there are many capable people who are wasted like this.

Measures must be taken to raise such people and to help them in their development. We must remember that the success of every cause depends upon the cadres, as has often been pointed out by Comrade Stalin.

Finally, we must have the ambition as Bulgarian Communists, that as the leading party, our party be exemplary in every respect. With our allies, the Agrarians, Zvnos, Social Democrats and the Radicals, we must know how to work together as comrades for the common cause.

We must be the first in the great national movement of the Fatherland Front. Do not forget that men do not always accomplish what they wish, but what the conditions impose upon them. Let us by our exemplary Fatherland Front work and by our struggle create such conditions in Bulgaria that all our allies as well as those elements among the people who are still vacillating, become wholehearted adherents of the historic cause of the Fatherland Front.

LETTERS TO THE DAILY HERALD

April 9, 1946

Dear Sir,

I read your article by Harold Laski on "What the Communists are After" with very great interest. May I suggest you now publish Dimitrov's speech in full, so that your readers may judge

for themselves the extent of Laski's deliberate distortions. In particular, will you please publish from that speech any section of it where Dimitrov states or implies, to quote Laski: "Dimitrov avers without hesitation that the Communist aim is to stab the Social Democratic Parties in the back."

However, Laski can perhaps best be answered by Laski himself when it comes to refuting distortions against the Communist Party's application for affiliation to the Labour Party. In November, 1936, writing in *The Labour Monthly* on the debate at the Labour Party Conference on Affiliation, he stated:

"The debate was farcical, and not even honestly so. . . . The arguments used were pitiful."

Laski then refers to each one of these pitiful arguments, and answers them. Now he himself brings forward every argument that he once correctly branded as "pitiful."

Yours faithfully,

HARRY POLLITT.

This letter was published in the *Daily Herald* together with another article by Professor Laski, on which Harry Pollitt made the following comments in a further letter to the *Daily Herald*:

Dear Sir,

April 24, 1946

The readers of the *Daily Herald* will not have failed to notice that Harold Laski could not produce a single sentence from Dimitrov's recent speech which in any way implied that the policy of the Communist Parties towards Social Democratic Parties was "to stab them in the back." You may be quite sure that if such a statement had been made by Dimitrov, Laski would have produced it.

Mr. Laski is, however, correct when he draws attention to the situation we are now in as compared with 1939.

The problems which have to be solved will grow in seriousness and urgency as time goes on—the problems of food, production, foreign markets; the complete destruction of fascism and the building of security and peace. Especially grave is the economic position facing Britain once the replacement boom is ended.

A successful solution is going to call as never before for the sustained and united effort of every section of the working-class movement. For the fight of reaction will grow in intensity, and formidable new competitive forces will face British production,

not only from the United States, but Australia and Canada as well.

Mr. Laski puts the question to me: why not disband the Communist Party as the proof of your sincere desire to become part of the Labour Party?

Why do we wish to maintain our separate organisation? Because we believe that only in this way can Communists make their full and much-needed contribution to strengthen the Labour Party, as they have done to strengthen the Trade Union movement.

It would be little use having the Communists inside the Labour Party if they were forbidden to continue Marxist discussion and propaganda; if the *Daily Worker* were to disappear; if those who were too consistently friendly with the Soviet Union were liable to be expelled.

Professor Laski himself has admitted the need of the Labour Party for a philosophy and training, to unite the enormous mass of individuals attached to it into a Party fit to govern the State and lead Britain to Socialism. Speaking recently to the Kilmarnock Fabian Society, he said:

"What the Labour Party needs is first of all a philosophy; and secondly, knowledge—not general knowledge, not the kind of knowledge one gets by reading the *Daily Express* nor, for that matter, by reading the *Daily Herald* or Mr. Swaffer. I mean true knowledge—organised ability to draw adequate inferences. . . . If we are to make ourselves a Party fit to govern the State, we have got to know why we are Socialists and what we are going to do with our Socialism."

(*Kilmarnock Standard*, 12.1.46.)

Strength is not merely a matter of numbers, but of the unity and discipline that can only be based on understanding. It is not "any kind of knowledge" picked up from capitalist sources that we need, but knowledge and ideas tested by experience and needs of the working-class movement—that is Marxism.

We believe that the affiliation of our Party would bring this Marxism into the Labour Party. This is the surest defence this movement has against any repetition of its experience with J. R. MacDonald and Jimmy Thomas.

There are certain Labour leaders whose conception of Socialism is limited to nationalisation with lavish compensation, leaving untouched the system of production for rent, interest and profit over the greater part of our economic life. The Communist Party is doing all in its power to rally the working class to make nationalisation successful as the next immediate step for the

head of a Marxist party.

working class on the road to Socialism. But we are under no illusions that this means Socialism has been achieved. There are harder struggles yet to come. That is why we fight against all tendencies to water down Labour's programme and make it more acceptable to the capitalists, whether in Britain or the U.S.A. That way lies disillusion and the opportunity for fascism to re-appear in the world.

But meanwhile, does the request to disband our Party "as a test of sincerity" also apply to the Fabian Society, Haldane Society, and the Political Committee of the Royal Arsenal Co-operative Society, all of which are affiliated to the Labour Party?

We believe that our affiliation to the Labour Party would represent, in British conditions, a first step towards realising at a later stage one single working-class political Party.

We are not afraid to be judged on our record. Where is there any "stab in the back" policy being carried out in the Trade Unions where our members hold leading positions in the unions of the miners, engineers, railwaymen, transport workers, electricians, foundry and distributive workers?

Will Mr. Shinwell state whether or not Arthur Horner, the Coal Production Officer of the National Union of Mineworkers has been carrying out the stab in the back policy? Of course he won't, because he knows only too well the great assistance he has received from him.

I will guarantee that if the Communist Party were affiliated to the Labour Party it will make a contribution to that party in thought, education and practical work which will reflect itself in a new spirit of enthusiasm in every local Labour organisation in the country. We ask for no favours or special privileges other than those enjoyed by other organisations affiliated to the Labour Party with their separate central and local organisations.

May I suggest to Mr. Laski that when next he warns the Labour movement of dangers which confront it, he should stress the danger of the Labour Party seeing Communism as its main enemy rather than capitalism.

Yours faithfully,

HARRY POLLITT.