

the breathing picture they give of Marx and Engels. The letters are between two magnificent human beings, great revolutionaries. The memory of Marx and Engels is bound to be held not only in respect but in affection by those who read these letters.

It is a good translation : and a pleasure to read after the mangling of Marx and Engels which British and American readers have had offered to them in so many versions. The notes, both of V. Adoratsky and the English editor, are also good. Finally, there is a full and carefully made index.

R. P. A.

AT ONCE A THINKER AND A MAN OF ACTION.

Letters to Dr. Kugelmann. By Karl Marx. (Martin Lawrence Ltd. 3s. 6d.)

WE are still terribly behind with the publication of Marxist works in this country, but Martin Lawrence is making gallant efforts to bridge the gap. Still it is a sad commentary that the famous collection of letters which Marx wrote from London to his intimate friend Kugelmann have only just been published. Lenin's introduction reminds us that they were published in Tsarist Russia as long ago as 1907 ! But of course the Russians always devoured Marx, the first foreign translation of "Capital" to appear was in the Russian language.

These letters contain much personal material as well as comments on current events, people and Marx's own scientific work. The frequent references to poverty and ill-health (for several years Marx was affected with carbuncles) reveal the terrible difficulties under which he carried on his mighty scientific labours. It was not until 1869 that Marx, thanks to the assistance of his great comrade-in-arms, Engels, was able "to work in peace."

Like the larger volume *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, these *Letters* give us a vivid picture of the thinker and man of action, the perfect combination of theory and practice. Lenin siezes on this feature of the *Letters* and emphasises it with great vigour in order soundly to belabour Plekhanov, who after the 1905 Revolution had behaved like a "scolding schoolmistress" and had denounced the workers for taking up arms.

And as Plekhanov had compared himself to Marx, Lenin drives home the comparison—to the discomfiture of Plekhanov. Marx was against a rising in Paris in 1871, but once the Commune had been established, he supported it with all the passion of his fiery nature. In his letters to Kugelmann Marx shows that he had nothing but admiration for the bravery and "historical initiative" of the Parisians. "World history," wrote Marx, "would, indeed, be very easy to make, if the struggle were taken up only on condition of infallibly favourable chances."

When Lenin wrote his preface he did not know that Kautsky had suppressed one of the most important letters, the one of February 23rd, 1865, dealing with Lassalle's so-called "*real politik*," which was really opportunism, the sacrificing of the revolutionary aims of the working class for immediate interests. This letter has been rescued and included in the present edition by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute.

But Marx was equally merciless towards the sectarians and these letters which give some glimpses of his work in the First International, show how he

was able to unite widely varying groups for common struggle, to organise international action, to spread the principles of Communism and to work out a clear tactical line. Of particular interest in this connection are the letters referring to Ireland and the letter of the General Council of the First International to the Brunswick Committee, written by Marx and sent by him to Kugelmann.

From a collection of such letters covering so many varying subjects each reader will select for himself which is the most interesting and important. All those who read Marx because they want "to acquire the ability to mould the future" (as Lenin puts it) will find ample material for thought, whether it be in the letters expounding economic theory and commenting on the works of scientists and sociologists, or those dealing with the daily activities of the revolutionary movement.

W. R.

INDIA AS IN FACT IT IS.

British Imperialism in India. Joan Beauchamp. (Martin Lawrence Ltd., 33 Great James Street, London.) 222 pp. 5s.

THERE always has been a long-felt want of a book on India dealing with the modern aspect of life, involving problems of Capitalism and Imperialism.

At last a book has appeared, and it is indeed the right type of book written by Joan Beauchamp for the Labour Research Department and published by Martin Lawrence. It is a book which ought to have a place in every public free library of this country as well as of America, and searchers after truth on Economics should take steps to see that the libraries in their district have one. Members of Trade Union branches, especially in the Textile, Mining, Steel, Engineering and Seafaring trades should insist on their branches buying a copy for circularising among their members.

If any of the numerous highly-paid Trade Union officials in Great Britain had due sense of responsibility to their working-class patrons, and had even half the understanding of modern Imperialism as is possessed by Joan Beauchamp, they would have long ago produced for British and Indian readers a series of books and pamphlets along the lines of the present book which we review here. Had they done so, one gets out of breath to take stock of what anti-labour terrorist measures in India, and in Britain, would have never taken place. The wholesale massacres of Moplahs in Southern India, of Punjabis in Jalianwala Bag (Amritsar), of the Tharawaddi Burmans and of factory and transport workers in Bombay, Calcutta, Chittagong, Peshawar, Sholapur, Ahmedabad and numerous places in India would never have occurred. The disgraceful Meerut Trial would never have been concocted, and would have saved a Labour Government from its shame. The Trade Union Movement in India with a healthy support of British workers would have grown to power, and five million preventable deaths which occur in India every year would have been checked and reduced to a minimum.

The reflex of this safeguard for Indian workers and peasants would have saved British workers from some of the catastrophic attacks upon their rights and standards. The General Strike of 1926 would not have failed to gain success. The anti-Miners' Act and the Trades Disputes Act would not have seen the