In September 1921, the President of the Communist International, Grigorii Zinoviev, wrote to its national sections on ‘The Character of our Newspapers’. The circular was a supplement to the ‘Theses on Organisation’ revised and adopted at the third world congress that July. They provided Moscow’s first practical guidance for a ‘new type of communist organ’ based on the Bolshevik daily, Pravda. ‘Newspapers play a great part in our agitation’, Zinoviev stated, but ‘up till now have been very unsatisfactory’. ‘Our papers are too dry, too abstract’, he continued, containing ‘very little’ of interest to working men and women. One eye-catching assertion was that comrades use the pencil over the pen: ‘The rank and file appreciate very much poignant sarcasm, a vitriolic sneer hurled at the enemy. One caricature which hits the nail on the head is of better use than scores of high flown so-called ‘Marxist’ boring articles. Our papers must search for people who are able and want to serve the idea of the proletarian revolution with their pencil.’ Despite this official endorsement of cartoon copy in the Comintern press, academic attention on its pictorial content has been patchy. Communist cartooning has received critical attention in other national contexts, but existing studies of Britain have centred on the ‘Popular Front’ era of the 1930s, most notably the London-based Artists International Association (AIA, 1933-53). This article examines the first generation of communist cartoonists and transnational networks, that shaped the cartoons of the British movement’s formative weeklies between 1917 and 1925.

The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) was founded in summer 1920. During the two and three-quarter years that followed the October Revolution of 1917, the line of succession within British Bolshevism had been fiercely contested. Section I argues that in the proto-communist press, social democratic cartooning traditions remained prominent in debating the tenets of a future communist party. Cartoons were sourced through networks that took informal and institutional forms. Politically, they were grounded in international struggles for socialism, feminism and peace. Journalistically, they used processes of reprinting and adaption integral to print culture during this period. Section II contends that in the early 1920s, the Communist Party press became the primary vehicle for experimental left-wing cartooning. But the value of newspaper cartoons was contested within the party and reflected in broader debates with Moscow. Under the influence of ‘Bolshevisation’ - that sought to cleanse national parties of social-democratic remains - cartoon circulation was diverted through Comintern channels. In spite of attempts to homogenise its forms and practices, a dynamic culture of communist cartooning was sustained, if not always encouraged.

The British Socialist Party formed the largest constituent of the CPGB. Founded in 1912 from the Social Democratic Party and ILP left-wing, the BSP could trace its roots through the indigenous Marxist tradition constituted by the H.M. Hyndman’s Democratic Federation (SDF) in 1881. Since the launch of the SDF’s, Justice (1884-1925), socialist organs were produced by ad-hoc networks of activist writers and artists. The professional staffs of the Daily Herald (1912-64) and Daily Citizen (1912-16) were an exception, with most relying on unpaid contributions out of financial necessity or political doctrine, as rank-and-file papers produced through sacrifice to the cause. These practices remained crucial to nascent communist organs. As the First World War shattered the unity of the Second International (1889-1916), so the BSP had divided. The Call had been launched in February 1916 by the BSP’s anti-war internationalists - in opposition to Justice and Hyndman’s pro-war right-wing. The ousting of the Hyndmanites at the 1916 Easter conference cemented the BSP’s position on the anti-war left and inadvertently set the cornerstone of the CPGB.

Prior to the launch from The Call of the CPGB organ, The Communist (1920-23), the weeklies of the Socialist Labour Party and Workers’ Socialist Federation were the main carriers of ‘Bolshevik’ cartoons in Britain. Whilst The Call made little use of pictorial copy, The Socialist (1902-23) and Workers’ Dreadnought (1914-24), frequently carried cartoons on their front pages. These were set between a column and full-page in size, with the larger prints doubling as detachable posters for specific campaigns.

Founded in 1912 by Sylvia Pankhurst as organ of the East London Suffrage Federation, the Worker’s Dreadnought reflected her artistic and political journey from suffrage campaigner to revolutionary communist. It served the Federation through its reincarnations as the Workers’ Suffrage Federation (1916-18), Workers’ Socialist Federation (1918-20) and Communist Party, British Section of the Third International (1920-21).

Personal contacts cultivated by Pankhurst were important sources of original and reprinted cartoons. The cartooning traditions of British socialism - past and present - were mined, with works by Walter Crane reprinted between 1915 and 1922. His Cartoons for the Cause (1896) had inspired Pankhurst to paint ‘in the service of the great movements for social betterment’. Crane’s romantic allegories of triumphant struggle towards a future communal society, contrasted starkly from the militant caricature of his successors, yet held an enduring influence on the visual iconography of the British left. This was evident in the engraved cartoons by Pankhurst and her young adherents, Hilda E. Jefferies and Herbert Cole, published in the Dreadnought during this period.
By 1917 cartoons were published in the *Dreadnought* on a near weekly basis, with a greater proportion reprinted from sympathetic papers abroad. Pankhurst’s international travel itinerary provided her with a global network of political and journalistic contacts that were brought to bear on the organ. Whilst in New York she met the influential feminist socialist Crystal Eastman and her brother Max, who edited *The Masses* (1911-17) – an innovative monthly that fused revolutionary politics and graphic art. Cartoons from *The Masses* and other US socialist papers featured in the *Dreadnought* from its early issues of 1914. Indeed, its first cartoon in defence of revolutionary Russia was reprinted from the *New York Call* (1908-23), east coast daily of Socialist Party of America. Published four months after the February revolution, the cartoon by veteran artist, Ryan Walker, questioned the democratic credentials of President Woodrow Wilson in pressuring Russia’s Provisional Government to remain in the First World War.

The transatlantic influence of US cartooning was still stronger in *The Socialist*. The SLP was founded by breakaway Scottish branches of the SDF under shop stewards, James Connolly and George Yates. Their critique of Hyndman’s authoritarian and reformist tendencies were grounded in Daniel DeLeon’s theory of industrial unionism and published in *Weekly People*, the New York organ of his Socialist Labor Party of America (SLPA).

Following Hyndman’s purge of ‘impossibilist’ factions, the DeLeonist exiles launched the British SLP, with Connolly’s *The Socialist* its adopted organ. The weekly commonly reprinted cartoons and articles from *Weekly People*, and other industrial unionist and syndicalist papers, such as the South African *International* (International Socialist League), the Brisbane-based *The Worker* (Australian Labor Party) and *The Toiler* (later of Communist Labor Party of Ohio). By reprinting cartoons from across the globe, the *Dreadnought* and *The Socialist* visualised the universal struggles of British activists and their comrades abroad.

Prior to the October revolution, however, the *Dreadnought*’s cartoons were expressing frustration at the creeping divisions, amongst the anti-war Zimmerwald movement and its International Socialist Commission, over an all party congress in Stockholm called by the Menshevik-led Petrograd Soviet. Entitled ‘Stockholm - the sun sinks whilst labour thinks’, the cartoon depicted the setting sun of ‘Internationalism’, with a bare-chested workman looking helplessly on. Ongoing indecision, the cartoon suggested, could end the hopes of the international struggle. The Bolshevik’s seizure of power just two months later met with cautious optimism, but the circumspection of many soon turned to reverence. A special supplement of *The Socialist* extolled: ‘across the triumph of Russian capitalism there looms the spectre of international socialism’. At the Annual Conference of May 1918, the WSF became the Workers’ Socialist Federation and urged the British proletariat to embrace the world revolution.

This firm commitment to revolutionary communism was pre-empted in the *Dreadnought* on 4th May, which featured its first cartoon to represent Bolshevik Russia. Drawn by a new contributor, Brown Willy, it juxtaposed the agency of Russian revolutionaries against the subservience of their British peers. In the foreground was a British worker (a union jack on his behind) pleading at the feet of a rotund capitalist; in the background is the rising sun of ‘Free Russia’ illuminating a stout worker striding forth with a banner marked ‘class conscious labour’. Blocking the sunlight from the British worker is a screen held in place by a bejewelled
skeleton’s arm. This stark image championed the precedent set by Soviet Russia, whilst bemoaning the absence of revolutionary class consciousness in Britain (obscured, it was suggested, by capitalist greed and destruction).

No further cartoons were published in the *Dreadnought* until the post-war ‘coupon election’ of December. Thereafter the content of the *Dreadnought*’s cartoons became increasingly pro-Bolshevik. This transition was led through works reprinted from US monthlies, most notably, *The Liberator* (1918-24) and *Good Morning* (1919-21). On 16th August 1919, the *Dreadnought* reprinted a Clive Weed cartoon from *The Liberator* that echoed the burgeoning class consciousness of Willy’s. It depicted two workmen sitting down on their lunch break, one eating a sandwich, the other reading a paper, ‘The Cry-Bune’: ‘I know what this Bolshevism means, Bill’, the reader says to the other, ‘it means us!’

On 6 November 1919, *The Call* celebrated the second anniversary of the Russian Socialist Republic. The commemorative contents were prominently advertised on the paper’s front page, including a ‘special article by N. Lenin’ and ‘a cartoon by Will Dyson’. Whilst the Bolshevik leader’s contribution was the headline attraction, more extraordinary was the publication of a cartoon by the doyenne of socialist cartoonists. An Australian who moved to London in 1910, Dyson had cartooned at the dissident *Daily Herald* for almost a decade. Under the pre-war editorship of American syndicalist, Charles Lapworth and young typographer and sub-editor, Francis Meynell, Dyson’s venomous cartoons against capitalism, militarism and parliamentary politics displayed an acidity rarely seen in Britain since the early nineteenth-century. Whilst never a card-carrying communist himself, Dyson’s legacy resonated through the infant Bolshevik press. Plotted across the entire back page, it was the only cartoon published over *The Call*’s four year existence. Entitled, ‘The English in Russia’, Dyson’s cartoon depicted a Prussian general (‘Old Order’) kneeling before an allied politician and pleading: ‘Forgive me, forgive me – that in my presumption I once hoped to be your equal in brutality!’ Against the backdrop of the Russian Civil War, it presented allied support for anti-Bolshevik forces as equivalent to the Prussian militarism defeated by the *Entente* twelve months before. In the general’s hand was drawn a capitalist top hat containing a document, ‘Cordon Sanitaire’, referencing the proposal of French Prime Minister, Georges Clemenceau, for the liberated Baltic States to form a defensive cordon against the westward spread of Soviet communism.
If not uncritical of Bolshevik methods, the *Herald* was Fleet Street’s most prominent defender of the early Soviet Republic. Whilst Dyson had viewed the revolution less optimistically than his colleagues at the paper, its publication of secret government circulars on British intervention outraged the cartoonist. War Minister, Winston Churchill, became a recurrent target of Dyson’s cartoons during the ‘Hands-Off Russia’ campaign.

Pro-Bolshevik rhetoric emerged coevally in the *Dreadnought*’s original cartoons. On 1st November Herbert Cole depicted a worker, casting the shadow of ‘Bolshevik International Labour’, being stabbed in the back with a knife ‘made in England’. The attacker was the White Army General, Anton Denikin, who Cole drew casting the shadow of ‘International Capitalism’. The following week his cartoon, ‘John Bull Champion Baby Killer’, offered a yet more damning indictment of the allied blockade of the Baltic. Alongside the caption, ‘Holder of the World Record: Be British! Women and Children First!’, the cartoon showed John Bull [Britain] jumping on a pile of dying children, wielding a club marked ‘blockade’ and a can of stolen ‘milk’, as the mothers of ‘Russia’ and ‘Germany’ looked up in tears from their knees. [Fig.4] Recalling Dyson, Cole blamed British militarism for the starvation and death of innocent women and children. These cartoons marked a striking change in the cartoonist’s approach. Whilst containing traces of his earlier allegorical works, the envenomed and unflinching nature of Cole’s post-revolution cartoons suggests a radicalisation of his politics and art amidst the brutalising context of war. A comparable transformation is palpable in the early Bolshevik civil war posters of Aleksandrs Apsitis.

Meanwhile, the Comintern’s formation that March had renewed the impetus of Moscow’s call for a united British party. A cross-party unity committee agreed in principle, but the tactics to be adopted proved divisive. Each group’s organ asserted their position in both written and pictorial forms. With the WSF and SLP leaderships refusing compromise on the BSP’s demand for Labour Party affiliation, the discussions appeared at an impasse by the New Year. On 5 February 1920 *The Socialist* carried a full page cover cartoon on the Paisley by-election campaign. The artist ‘Babe’ depicted the Labour candidate wearing a top hat and sandwich board of electoral pledges with ‘Wait and See Chloroform for the Masses’ on the front and ‘Capitalism’ on the back (reflected in a mirror behind him). This editorial cartoon restated the SLP rejection of reformism, but willingness to participate in the electoral process to propagate revolutionary socialism. It urged workers not to vote for the capitalist serving ‘un-holy trinity’ of Labour or coalition candidates, but to withhold their votes for socialism. ‘Babe’ was the only cartoonist prior the CPGB’s foundation to draw original cartoons for more than one proto-communist organ, with different works published in *The Socialist* and *Workers’ Dreadnought* during
the unity debates. Sylvia Pankhurst’s anti-parliamentarianism was by then resolute. A **Dreadnought** cartoon entitled, ‘Capitalists Don’t Need Any Parliamentary Socialists To-Day’, condemned Labour and by extension the BSP. ‘Come back when the revolution is on’, a capitalist says to a reformist, ‘I’ll need you then to help me stay in power under the cloak of your kind of socialism.’ During the Paisley by-election, internal disquiet over the SLP’s executive’s dogmatic stance prompted the resignation of *The Socialist*’s editor, Tom Bell, who with Arthur MacManus and William Paul had continued unofficial negotiations. That April pro-unity SLP members founded the Communist Unity Group (CUG) and stated ‘the urgent demand’ for ‘a policy that will unify all courageous elements for immediate revolutionary action.’ This act of dissent paved the way for the CPGB’s formation that summer. The WSF’s Easter conference pre-empted that event by reconstituting itself as the Communist Party (BSTI).

The Federation’s relaunch as the BSTI was marked in the *Dreadnought* by the publication of a leftist ‘Constitution for British Soviets: Points for a Communist Programme’. Embedded into the text was a cartoon by the foremost cartoonist of Italian socialism, Giuseppe Scalarini. Since the 1890s Scalarini had cartooned for the Milan-based organ of the Italian Socialist Party (PSI), *Avanti!*, for which Pankhurst had contributed articles since 1918. Pankhurst’s contacts in Italy had extended through her relationship with Italian Anarchist, Silvio Corio, then on the *Dreadnought*’s editorial board. After covering the preliminary meetings of the Versailles conference, Corio and Pankhurst embarked on a European tour of leftist milieu including the PSI congress in Bologna, at which the party voted to join the Comintern. The introduction of Scalarini’s cartoons to the *Dreadnought* coincided with this tour - the first to be republished, ‘Italy at the Peace Conference’, appeared in February.

Over twenty Scalarini cartoons appeared in *Dreadnought* over the next four years. This relationship was at its height during the months preceding the first unity convention, with drawings by Scalarini reprinted on an almost weekly basis between February and July 1920. His cartoons engaged with a range of labour struggles and celebrated the early promise of the Soviet Republic. In June, for example, one was prominently reprinted as ‘Bolshevism: The Hope of the Workers’. It depicted a worker holding an axe aloft to deflect sunlight into the eyes of a capitalist. As the frequency of their publication increased, the provenance ascribed to Scalarini’s cartoons also changed. Initially credited in the *Dreadnought* as ‘from the *Avanti!*’; by 1920 their authenticity was being more directly assigned as ‘drawn by Scalarini’. This re-ascription of provenance, suggested formalised arrangements between the cartoonist and the *Dreadnought*, with *Avanti!* no longer cited. The universal language of political cartooning meant the tropes deployed in these images - class exploitation, militarism, censorship - cut across national and linguistic boundaries. This was not crude ‘scissors and paste journalism’. While most US cartoons were simply reprinted, the captions or in-frame para-texts of foreign language cartoons were not always directly translated, but rewritten to situate their visual discourse within a British context. A cartoon published as ‘Direct Action’ in March 1920 is an example. [Fig.5] Set against the backdrop of a factory, it depicted a worker’s hand gripping on a pair of pliers that were squeezing a rotund capitalist. This cartoon had originally appeared in *Avanti!* the previous month, under the title ‘Le Tenaglie’ (‘The Tongs’). [Fig.6] When reprinted and re-captioned in the *Dreadnought*, it visualised the BSTI’s line on the futility of industrial conciliation.
While the contours of these networks remain unclear, evidence of pictorial copy passing through official Comintern channels is visible from January 1920. In that month, stock portraits of Russian Bolsheviks and other European revolutionaries were published on the front pages of The Call and The Socialist. The following month, The Call, published a series of emotive photographs depicting ‘Life under the Soviets’. Challenging the reportage and atrocity stories published on Fleet Street, they presented the lives of working families in Soviet Russia as honourable and progressive, by depicting the first congress of women workers, childcare, leisure, education and agriculture. As very few Britons had first-hand experience of revolutionary Russia, these images were no doubt more significant than lengthy reports in shaping perceptions of the new regime. The following month, The Socialist, printed a ‘series of Original Bolshevik Cartoons never before published in Britain.’ Prominently advertised in preceding issues, the cartoons were eventually printed across the cover under the headlines: ‘Art and the Fight for Freedom in Russia’ (11 March 1920) and ‘Labour and Art in Russia’ (18 March 1920). That Soviet cartoons had not been republished earlier in Britain suggests the slow development of journalistic networks between Moscow and affiliated parties at the periphery. The Comintern’s structural apparatus remained skeletal. Before the 1921 formation of the Orgbureau and its sub-departments for agitprop and publishing, the ECCI Secretariat coordinated the channels of contact. Nonetheless, informal relations between activists or parties remained integral to the production and circulation of revolutionary cartoons within and across national boundaries.


The final issue of The Call was published two days before the founding convention of the CPGB in July 1920. Its editorial explained that ‘the BSP will cease its separate existence’ and the Communist Party will ‘establish at the same time its own weekly organ, for the expression and advocacy of the fundamental principles and policy.’ The following week, The Communist, was launched from the former paper’s offices, with Fred Willis retaining the editor’s chair. Given the paucity of cartoons in The Call, it is no surprise that the only pictorial copy printed in The Communist under Willis were occasional photographs.
While *The Communist* featured no cartoons, their importance to the independence of *The Socialist* and *Workers’ Dreadnought* were amplified, as they continued to critique the CPGB’s direction.⁵⁹ On 2nd September 1920, *The Socialist*’s leading article, ‘The Tall Hat: A Tale of Unity’, featured a roughly drawn cartoon by ‘WM’. [Fig.7] It depicted a worker stood on a hillside marked ‘SLP tactics’, with ‘revolutionary activities’ being illuminated by the sun of ‘social revolution’. As he looked down over the valley below strewn with ‘compromise’, ‘reaction’ and ‘Labour Party affiliation’, the worker commented to the reader ‘That’s no place for me.’⁶⁰ Discarded on the ground was a copy of ‘St. Paul’s epistle on unity’, satirising the founding principles of the CPGB as akin to the Paul the Apostle’s New Testament book on Christian entity.

![Fig.7]

Despite Pankhurst’s clashes with Lenin over parliamentary action at the Second Comintern Congress, her journalistic talent was recognised by Moscow. Since the Comintern’s formation she had been British correspondent of the *Communist International*. In December 1920 Zinoviev threatened to shift responsibly for its English edition from the CPGB to Pankhurst.⁶¹ By that time she advocated entering the CPGB to consolidate its left-wing, which the BSTI did at the second unity convention in Leeds.⁶² The organs of its new constituents soon became problematic. The executive recommended that *Solidarity* (Shop Stewards and Worker Committee Movement), *The Plebs* (Plebs League), and *The Worker* (Communist Labour Party) were admissible for circulation within the party due to their educational or industrial value, but that the *Workers Dreadnought*, *The Socialist*, and others should be barred for being ‘unorthodox from the party standpoint’.⁶³ With typical defiance Pankhurst retained the *Dreadnought*, as an ‘independent support’ to the party from its left.⁶⁴ On 9th April its cartoon depicted a ‘left wing’ worker, flying flags of the ‘International’ and ‘Communism’, looking down suspiciously at an ‘ILP’ member carrying a knapsack and dressed in a plaid jacket and bonnet rouge: ‘Comrade, don’t’, he urged the communist worker, ‘You’ll get hurt.’⁶⁵ The cartoon ridiculed middle-class reformists in the ILP who had shunned Comintern affiliation.⁶⁶

To reflect the CPGB’s expansion, the chairman Arthur McManus invited Francis Meynell to redesign *The Communist*. A former member of the WSF, Meynell had resigned from the *Daily Herald* over his role in the Bolshevik jewels scandal of 1920.⁶⁷ He agreed to edit *The Communist* for a six month period, with Raymond Postgate as sub-editor.⁶⁸ Meynell was given free licence over the paper’s design and contents, which allowed him to experiment with typography and cartooning, something financial constraints had stymied during his *Herald* redesign.⁶⁹ It has been estimated that *The Communist* was allocated some £12,000 of the £55,000 the CPGB officially received from the Comintern channels that year.⁷⁰ This provided Meynell with a production and staffing budget that Willis or Pankhurst would have dreamed of. The new look weekly relaunched on 20 January
Political cartoons were introduced as a core component of its armoury. The Communist regularly featured between four and eight cartoons, across its usual twelve page format, a quantity unprecedented in a British newspaper. Drawn by ‘Westral’, its first cartoon, ‘The Gate to More’, was positioned across the new editorial centrefold, signalling Meynell’s commitment to pairing written and visual copy. Westral’s identity remains a mystery, although as the artist’s cartoons were only published (or republished) during Meynell’s editorial tenure, it is clear that Westral was closely aligned to the editor, if not Meynell himself. Fear of legal prosecution or professional alienation prompted many revolutionary artists to use pen-names. Early communist cartoonists, such as ‘Willy’, ‘Babe’, ‘Redcap’ and ‘Rouge’ remained ‘shadowy figures’. Whilst subverting the cult of journalistic celebrity nurtured by ‘New Journalism’, their pseudonyms acquired a notoriety of their own.

The second issue, featured a cartoon from the pen of another unknown artist, ‘J.D. Bream’. Entitled, ‘The Power to Be!’ it contained the only direct reference to the unity debates to appear in The Communist’s cartoons. Updating the work of nineteenth century French satirist, Honoré Daumier, it depicted Winston Churchill, Lloyd George and Labour MPs Ramsay MacDonald and Jimmy Thomas, fleeing from a towering worker marked ‘Communist Unity’. The same issue saw the arrival of Will Hope. Following spells at New Zealand Truth and New York Globe, Hope had been appointed by Meynell to illustrate the Daily Herald’s sports page in 1918, where he had regularly appeared alongside Dyson. Hope’s heavy, sometimes crayoned, lines were not dissimilar from his fellow Australasian, while his left-wing credentials had been honed at the Truth under the editorship of Robert Hogg, a former activist in the Scottish ILP, who turned the paper towards revolutionary industrial unionism during New Zealand’s general strike of 1913. After his first cartoon for The Communist, Hope took Meynell’s advice of changing his signature to ‘Espoir’.

While Hope and Westral provided editorial cartoons, artists like Michael Boland and Redcap contributed works for other sections of the paper. Editorial comment about its cartoons became a common feature of The Communist, asserting their meaning to the reader. To circumvent a wholesalers’ boycott, for example, Meynell creatively purchased multi-page advertisements in the Herald, using the space to print extracts from The Communist and descriptions of its cartoons. A week after the Herald advertisement, Meynell’s editorial ‘Breaking down the Boycott’ was embedded with a cartoon that depicted a communist worker ‘rubbing their noses in it!’ by crushing ‘Wholesale News Agents’ and the ‘Secret Service’. The ongoing crusade against British Bolshevism of Scotland Yard chief, Sir Basil Thomson, made printers and distributors weary of communist associations.

Unlike in The Socialist or Workers Dreadnought, cartoons syndicated from Comintern or other left-wing publications were rarely republished under Meynell. Its early cartoons were explicitly by-lined ‘Drawn for the Communist’. This proclamation of provenance reflected the editor’s desire for vibrant originality. When cartoons from other publications were occasionally featured, they did so out of necessity or as carefully selected supplements to original drawings. For instance, after the confiscation of cartoons during a police raid in May 1921, the next issue carried a work by The Liberator’s William Gropper. By extension, the international struggle featured less prominently, although The Communist’s cartoons on British rule in Ireland or India were no less scathing than those more regularly published on domestic issues.
The policies of Lloyd-George’s coalition, and the supposed inability of Labour to hold them to account, were the cartoon’s primary targets. As in the old Daily Herald, they attacked Conservative, Liberal and Labour politicians with equal vigour. This was most apparent during the mining lock-out of April 1921. The Labour MP and National Union of Railwaymen (NUR) leader, J.H. Thomas, sued The Communist for libel over written and cartoon representations of his alleged role in the events of ‘Black Friday’. Thomas’ National Union of Railwaymen (NUR) and the National Transport Workers Federation (NTWF) had withdrawn solidarity for the Miners’ Federation of Great Britain (MFGB) in its dispute over safeguards for post-war de-nationalisation. The case became the first in Britain for over a century in which graphic satires of a national political figure were successfully prosecuted. Espoir’s infamy in communist circles was thereafter secured, temporarily moving him out of Dyson’s shadow.

Meynell departed The Communist at the end of his six month contract, leaving the same month that Dyson left the Daily Herald. Due to financial constraints, no immediate replacement for Dyson was appointed. Cartoons were published only sporadically, and those that did appear were often reprinted from foreign socialist papers. From September, however, intermittent cartoons by Will Hope were strikingly published in the Herald. These works were of a different temper, with his penetrating attacks in The Communist as ‘Espoir’ blunted in the Herald where he signed his own name. Two cartoons published in the respective papers during the second week of October illustrate this point. In the Herald, Hope parodied the impotence of the coalition government to tackle unemployment by framing Lloyd George mopping his brow and exclaiming, ‘Phew!’, under the heat of ‘unemployment crisis’ beaming down from the sun above. The next day, Hope’s ‘Espoir’ cartoon in The Communist made a more wounding incision to Lloyd George’s reconstruction pledge. Entitled ‘Homes For Heroes’, it portrayed an emaciated worker being nailed into a coffin marked ‘unemployment’ by three cigar smoking rotund capitalists wielding mallets marked ‘wage cuts’ and ‘starvation’. By the coffin’s side rested a wreath ‘to hell-he-go-land’, signed ‘from the bosses.’

With the Thomas libel trial less than two months away, Hope’s cameos in the Herald began when his stock was highest in far left circles. But how his talents should be utilised in service of the Party was questioned, as the Comintern prompted a review of its national organs. Meynell’s tenure marked The Communist’s heyday, but the organ became a point of internal conflict reflecting broader debates over the party’s future course. MacManus felt the paper under Meynell had ‘directly or indirectly increased the prestige and standing of the party’. Others were less supportive, with editorial opportunism and rising costs frequent criticisms. The Communist, it was argued, had become the ‘kept
preserve of a clique’, with Pankhurst claiming it had ‘fallen largely into the hands of the ‘Daily Herald’ group’.\(^{95}\) As Meynell himself later recognised: ‘I doubt whether there could ever have been a political party organ that showed so little awareness of its party’s ideology … The simple fact is we wrote and cartooned for ourselves’.\(^{97}\) Such an approach was out of step with the Comintern’s theses and Zinoviev’s memorandum, which reached London that September. In the same month, Pankhurst’s unwillingness to submit the *Dreadnought* to the party executive, led to her expulsion from the CPGB.\(^{98}\)

In a front-page editorial, Pankhurst described the party as ‘passing through a sort of political measles called discipline which makes it fear the free expression and circulation of opinion’. The *Dreadnought* she contended was alive to leftist minority debates of the wider international movement ‘not discussed in *The Communist*’.\(^{99}\) The former limped on independently, with reduced cartoon copy, before eventually folding in 1924.

In response to Moscow’s concerns over the progress of its British comrades, a party commission of Harry Pollitt, Albert Inkpin and Rajani Palme Dutt were charged with ‘Bolshevising’ the party and centralising its federal structure. In a memorandum to the Executive in early 1922, Dutt offered a scathing indictment of the organ and recommended a ‘complete review’ of its organisation, distribution and finance. He felt the circulation increase under Meynell was ‘artificial’ and the result of Black Friday. ‘The paper did nothing to educate the public’, he argued, ‘it fails to lead, has no clear drive or purpose or relation to Party activity.’\(^{100}\) Turning more specifically to its use of cartoons, Dutt contended that such ‘devices’ should be used for ‘driving home the organising point, never for purely journalistic purposes’.\(^{101}\) Instead of ‘tickling the public’ cartoons ‘should only be selected for direct agitational value’. He also viewed culling cartoons as a means of offsetting heavy financial losses, with one of the ‘principal items upon which saving has been made’ being ‘the cessation of payment to cartoonists’.\(^{102}\) There was no space for a reckless organ staffed by mercurial professional journalists or cartoonists, with no cartoonist listed in the recommended staff.\(^{103}\) What was needed was a paper run in a spirit of revolutionary sacrifice by ‘a devoted band of voluntary workers’.\(^{104}\) In this context, Hope’s moonlighting at the *Herald* was financially understandable.

Dutt’s recommendations were incorporated near verbatim in the final report ratified by the 1922 Annual Conference. But their demolition of cartooning as communist agitation was at odds with Zinoviev and other ECCI members. Leon Trotsky’s critique of the French Communist Party’s daily *L’Humanité*, similarly condemned its ‘vagueness’ of editorial line. Far from dispelling ‘the prejudices of parliamentary reformism and anti-parliamentary superstitions of anarchism’, he contended, its reports were ‘slurred over in … superficial contradictions, and in making puns and jokes.’ Like Zinoviev, however, Trotsky emphasised the value of its cartoons, by expressing his ‘admiration for the work of your paper’s wonderful cartoonist, Gassier’ [Henri Paul Gassier].\(^{105}\) Dutt’s contrasting interpretation to Zinoviev and Trotsky of the role of cartoons in a Bolshevised organ, played out in the Communist Party press over the next two years.

As the Comintern’s ‘united front’ was rolled out, *The Communist*’s editorials and cartoons were tempered. Direct attacks on individual Labour officials were replaced by broader warnings. Communists were encouraged into tactical alliances with other labour parties, promoting the common cause of defending the
immediate, basic interests of the working class against the bourgeoisie’. During the Engineering Lockout, for example, Hope’s editorial cartoon of 18 March 1922 visualised, ‘a message to the General Council’. It depicted the locked-out miner of Black Friday, asking the reader: ‘Don’t leave the Engineers to fight alone. Remember what happened to me when I was deserted.’ The adjacent editorial demanded: ‘Fight Like Hell... We Demand a Special All Labour Congress To Make The United Front – To Stop The Retreat’. The party’s cartoonists had realigned their sights.

This coincided with cartoons from other Comintern papers being reprinted with greater regularity. In light of Dutt’s memorandum, this change was as financial as political. Like in the Dreadnought after 1918, cartoons were reprinted most commonly from The Liberator, which in October 1922 formerly aligned to the Workers Party of America (the legal manifestation of the Communist Party USA). Meanwhile, Dutt and former Labour Research Department colleague, Robert Page Arnot, were charged with realising Lenin’s vision for a quasi-independent international monthly under communist editorship. The Labour Review was launched in July 1921, with its name and contents exuding the ‘united front’. This line took pictorial form through its ‘Cartoons of the Month’, a periodic review of international cartoon discourse, not unlike that pioneered in W.T. Stead’s Review of Reviews. It contained four cartoons on average, with their paper and country of origin attributed.

Some were lifted from Comintern organs already familiar to the British left, such as L’Humanité, The Liberator and Avanti! Others were from social democratic organs, like New York Call, De Notenkraker (Dutch Social Democratic Workers Party), Die Freie Welt (German Independent Social Democratic Party) and even the French anarchist weekly, Les Hommes du Jous. By April 1922, however, the publication of cartoons had ceased, accompanied by an announcement that future issues would be sold at a reduced price: ‘we wished to establish the conception of quality first and foremost... whatever the cost involved in the form of cheapening production and the foregoing of returns on the part of contributors and workers on the journal.’ Cartoon copy had again been sacrificed. Though cheaper than commissioning originals, even reprinting cartoons could prove too costly.

Later that month, Hope took a break from The Communist, officially to further his artistic education. His departure from the journal was accompanied by a glowing farewell, reflecting his cult status on the paper:

This number of the COMMUNIST contains, we regret to say, what will be our last regular cartoon for some while from our Comrade Espoir. Espoir is going to Germany for a while to fraternise with artists there and learn, as he puts it, from the Bavarian masters. We shall receive sketches from him from time to time, but his usually weekly comment upon passing events will be lacking for some little while.

The stylistic similarities of Hope’s cartoons to those of the Munich based periodical, Simplicissimus, had been noted by contemporary commentators. Germany had become a key site for revolutionary graphic art after the German Revolution, through the ‘November Group’ (f.1918) and Union of Communist Artists of Germany (f.1924) of which cartoonist George Grosz was founding chairman. Whether or not Hope visited these groups is unknown. His work continued to appear in the British party press.

From the CPGB’s foundation, Moscow had pressured their British comrades to produce a daily paper. The Executive remained resolute in their assessment that a daily was beyond the party’s organisational and financial means. During the 1922 General Election, the Communist Daily was trialled, with Comintern
Launched on Monday 13th November, its front page proclaimed ‘the first number of the Worker’s Daily of the future is here!’ The banner headline: ‘Lenin on the Election ... Vote down the candidate of every capitalist party... Support the Labour and Communist Candidates.’ Inside featured two ‘Espoir’ cartoons that gave visual form to this rhetoric. The first entitled ‘The Scab’ depicted a worker in a polling booth. Faced with a straight choice between ‘capitalism’ and ‘labour’, ‘the scab’ was shown voting for the former. The second cartoon entitled ‘The Menace’ was more sinister, depicting the Labour Party as a pawn dressed in a bearskin of the Queen’s Grenadier Guards, whilst looming behind was a worker with a clinched fist: ‘We do not fear the Labour Party’, the caption reads, ‘but the men behind it (any speech by any Capitalist Politician)’. Espoir’s parody of the PLP as a pawn of the establishment would have done little to quell Labour fears over CPGB intentions.118

Two months later in February 1923, The Communist was replaced by the Workers’ Weekly. Dutt was again made editor, with Tom Wintringham as sub-editor - a position he also held on the Communist Daily.119 They aspired to produce a paper built solely upon the edicts of Moscow. In Dutt’s words: ‘the first real attempt at a real workers’ newspaper that will be to the English workers what Pravda has been to the Russian workers.’120 Cartoons by amateur rank-and-file artists featured rarely, however.121 In its early editions cartoon copy was commonly restricted to an editorial cartoon by Boland, with Espoir cartoons published on occasion.

The rebranding broadened the party organ’s appeal. By The Communist’s final number, circulation had fallen to 17,000, but in the Weekly’s first month this had risen to 50,000, before averaging between 35,000 and 40,000 at the General Election of November 1923.122 That campaign was again fought on a united front platform. The week before the nation went to polls, Boland’s front-page cartoon reworked the template of Bream’s 1921 ‘communist unity’ cartoon by drawing a giant smiling worker standing over a city and holding a policy manifesto before him: ‘vote Labour and Communist; no divided ranks’, it read, ‘a workers’ government, a workers’ program.’ Cowering in horror, beneath the worker, were Lloyd-George, Churchill, Stanley Baldwin and Herbert Asquith. Above the cartoon the banner headline charged: ‘Return working class representatives and make them fight on the Communist Programme.’123

Dutt’s editorials welcomed the prospect of a minority Labour Government, which was met with horror by other sections of Fleet Street. While MacDonald’s administration was in power, newspaper cartoonists
contested tropes of imminent ‘Red Ruin’. This coincided with a change in the *Daily Herald*’s approach to cartooning. After three years of infrequent contributions and syndicated cartoons, original political works again became prominent. Backed by new finance, the editor, Henry Hamilton Fyfe looked to utilise talent from the wider movement. Despite the increased sensitivity of the Labour leadership to Bolshevik infiltration, Fyfe appointed Hope to the *Herald*’s permanent staff in March 1924. When a disciplined Labour daily seemed paramount, the recruitment of a past nemesis of that party was bold and politically sensitive. Whilst the reasoning behind the decision is absent from the records, a number of factors could have smoothed Hope’s appointment. Firstly, if his *Communist* cartoons had been a double-edged success, their public impact was indisputable. In his previous editorial role, Fyfe had transformed the *Daily Mirror* into a popular illustrated paper through elevated use of cartoons and photojournalism. If communist cartooning remained at the vanguard of British left-wing cartooning, Hope’s appointment may have seemed a risk worth taking. Secondly, Lansbury as General Manager and Director remained influential on the Board, from which Thomas had resigned due to his appointment as Colonial Secretary. For Hope, the prospect of paid cartooning and ‘united fronts’ may have eased his political conscience over the move.

As the *Herald* extended its cartoon copy, so too did the *Workers’ Weekly*. This coincided with a scathing memorandum from Zinoviev on ‘The Immediate Tasks of the British Communist Party’: ‘The editorship of the weekly organ is far from satisfactory’, he wrote. The task of the party ‘was not to repeat stereotyped phrases about the united front, but at every step to expose the milk and water and treacherous character of MacDonald’s so-called ‘Labour Government’. It must raise the tone of its agitation to the stage of lashing and branding...’

In the issues that followed this damning critique, a more dynamic approach to cartooning is evident in the *Weekly*. Multiple cartoons by Michael Boland (now signed as ‘Michael’) were printed each week, with calls for unity increasingly prefixed by direct criticism of MacDonald’s administration. During this period, the *Weekly* also began to contest the cartoons of rival labour weeklies. On 18 July, as the Prime Minister chaired the London conference on German reparations, the *Weekly* featured a cartoon previously published in the ILP organ, *New Leader*. To challenge the cartoon’s intended meaning, the original was altered and printed on the *Weekly*’s frontpage. ‘The above’ the caption read;

```
is a copy of a cartoon which appeared in last week’s ... official ILP organ. The only alteration that we have made is in the face of the cat [MacDonald]. The cartoonist advises the worker’s ‘to beware’. We ask them to beware also of a party which condemns reparations in cartoons, but supports them in practice.
```

The cartoon challenged MacDonald’s about-turn over Labour’s manifesto pledge to revise the Versailles settlement on reparations. This practice of remediating rival cartoon copy was unheralded in the British communist press.

Despite Dutt’s previous ambivalence over the value of cartooning, the party organ’s cartoon copy was reinvigorated. An ongoing deference to pre-Bolshevised forms was apparent in this process. That year’s bumper May Day issue mirrored Meynell’s *Communist* by printing eight cartoons in single-panel and banner forms. Works by ‘Michael’ and ‘Lemen’ - on pages one, three and five - attacked capitalism and Labour in tandem. More
striking, however, was the back-page devoted to ‘May Day Memories of a Workers’ Daily’. The daily paper in memoriam was the pre-war Daily Herald and four Will Dyson cartoons were boldly reprinted – ‘with Acknowledgements’. [Fig.10]

Underneath a bordered appeal was made to the movement: ‘A Workers’ Daily is needed by the Workers’ Movement. It is needed to fight for the workers, as the old ‘Daily Herald’ once fought, and show up the sham of the ‘Labour’ leadership.’\(^{130}\) The cartoon gradualism of the ‘new’ Labour-owned Herald prompted the Weekly to recall the cartooning spirit of Dyson along communist lines.\(^{131}\) Yet, some within the party like Robert Page Arnot, believed that Dyson’s cartoons could not compensate for a genuine communist paper: ‘the organism of a real party. Not all the various bodies and organs that had grown up in the movement ten years before could make up for that lack, not even the pre-war Daily Herald with its Dyson cartoons.’\(^{132}\)

This rekindling of the Herald’s dissident past was unlikely to have pleased the Labour hierarchy. Will Hope’s tenure at the paper proved short-lived. During the final two months of 1924 his cartoons were gradually superseded by those of ‘AG’\(^ {133}\). Enduring communist associations troubled the paper’s board, and contributed to Hope’s sacking in early 1925. In the immediate aftermath of the minority government’s electoral defeat, the Labour National Executive re-endorsed the controversial Edinburgh amendment of 1922, reminding Constituency Labour Parties that no member of the CPGB could be endorsed as a Labour candidate for any public institution. The Weekly’s pre-election edition returned to the more formulaic ‘unity front’ rhetoric of the previous campaigns, with Hope’s ‘Espoir’ cartoon ‘The Scab’ reprinted.\(^ {134}\) Later that year, Clifford Allen the ILP chairman, gave a scathing assessment of Fyfe’s Herald as part of a ‘Sub-Committee on Editorial Policy’. He argued that ‘what is wrong with the Daily Herald is its spirit’ and placed the blame at the feet of Lansbury (‘its past owners and staff’): ‘It was and still is a semi-minority movement conspiracy … it cannot completely rid itself of the hideous hypocrisy of its old proprietors, who lifted their eyes to heaven with brotherly love on the tips of their tongues and fraternal hate on the tips of their tails.’\(^ {135}\) In a clear nod to likes of Hope and Postgate (then foreign editor), Allen remonstrated: ‘Bound up with this is the folly of permitting Communists or strategically retired Communists to be in important positions on the staff.’\(^ {136}\) The use of the term ‘strategically retired’ suggests that such rapprochement was perceived as cynical or subversive. Postgate departed the Herald soon
after with Lansbury, who resigned from the board ahead of an editorial review. Within weeks of their departure from the Herald, Lansbury, Meynell, Postgate and Hope were briefly reunited at Lansbury’s Labour Weekly (1925-27).\textsuperscript{137} Hope’s trade union the London Society of Compositors refused to contest his sacking and he soon immigrated to Canada. Writing to his old comrade Willie Gallagher in 1963, Hope recalled the damage done to his reputation: ‘it was very hard for me to leave Fleet Street, but there was no alternative... I beat it to a foreign country to regain my union card. I was hoping to return, but when [Sir Basil] Thomson invaded ... the apple card was upset.’\textsuperscript{138} For the time-being at least, the pioneers of communist cartooning in Britain had been silenced.

Conclusion

The 1930s saw an expansion of communist cultural activism, with Britain’s revolutionary artists organising collectively for the first time.\textsuperscript{139} The Daily Worker was presented as a break from the past, yet the approach to cartooning of its weekly predecessors was slow to fade from its pages.\textsuperscript{140} Early issues reprinted old cartoon stock by ‘Espoir’ and ‘Redcap’, alongside new cartoons and those from Comintern organs like Pravda and The Liberator.\textsuperscript{141} This article has argued that British communists mined indigenous and overseas cartooning cultures to contest the internal, national and international debates that shaped their movement after the Bolshevik revolution. During the early 1920s, communist organs moved to the forefront of left-wing cartooning in Britain. Despite the aspirations of their artists and editors, only Meynell’s Communist fused revolutionary politics and art in a format comparable to the organs of their German or American comrades. Transnational networks facilitated the reprinting and remediating of cartoon copy from across the international movement - processes driven by restricted resources as well as ideology. The value of cartoon copy was contested within the party and reflected in broader debates with Moscow. Whilst Dutt attempted to homogenise cartoon forms and practices through Bolshevisation, a vibrant culture of communist cartooning was sustained, as Zinoviev and others encouraged local artistic activism within official party lines. Whilst the informal print networks of the early movement were increasingly formalised by the Comintern’s apparatus, the first generation of communist cartoonists drew as much from the print traditions of their social democratic forebears, as those of their comrades in Moscow and beyond.
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