Stop the Irish War!

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. VIII. No. 34. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5TH, 1921. [WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

SOUTH WALES COLLIER WORKS THREE WEEKS FOR NOTHING

A comrade writes from Nantyffyllon, Bridgend:

"Collieries are idle about half their time, and some collieries are refusing to pay the minimum wage, which, as you know, protects the interests of the men employed in difficult working places.

"I spoke to one man to-day who has worked three weeks and received nothing in wages.

Miner Loses 2s. 6d. on His Work.

"He showed me his pay ticket, which was for £1 6s. He had to pay his boy £1 8s. 6d., so that he had a loss of 2/6 for the pleasure of working.

Miners Have to Pay Boys out of Their Savings.

"It happens, in this particular case, that the boy is his own son; but there are many such cases in the same colliery where the boy is no relation to the collier he works for, and men have had to go home to get money as best they can to pay their boys.

A Serious Charge Against Vernon Hartshorn.

"This is in the district of Mr. Vernon Hartshorn, M.P. He has been urging more production in this very district, and *has advised the men not to instruct him to fight for the minimum wage for men who are not doing their best.*"

The only chance of getting the legal minimum wage observed is, of course, to insist on its universal application. The employer can be trusted to dismiss the man whom it does not pay him to employ. No one can serve two masters, and Vernon Hartshorn cannot serve both the employers of labour and the workers.

Deductions from Wages.

In the House of Commons, on October 26th, Vernon Hartshorn himself quoted some bad cases of under-payment in South Wales.

He said: "I was at a meeting last night, and one workman asked me, 'How is it possible for a man to live on what we are getting at present?'

"He gave me a record of his earnings for the four previous weeks:

"'One week I got one day at 9/11, on each of two other weeks, three days at 8/11, and the other week I got two days at 9/11.'

"'Totalling that up for the four weeks, one comes to £4 3s. 3d., or an average of £1 0s. 10d. a week over four weeks.

"Let us see what has to come out of that —

"Fourpence, doctor's fund;

"Threepence, library fund;

"Fourpence, hospital;

"Fivepence, Health Insurance;

"Sevenpence, Unemployment Insurance;

"One shilling and fourpence, coal;

"Seven shillings and sixpence, rent;

"Sixpence, South Wales Miners' Federation.

"This made a total of eleven shillings and threepence per week continually deducted.

"The average earnings for the four weeks work out at only £1 0s. 10d. That leaves the man an average of 9s. 7d. per week to maintain his wife and children.

Working but Destitute.

"There are tens of thousands of men at work in the South Wales coalfields to-day who have to go to the Guardians, on the ground of destitution. So far from the Guardians being in a position to deal entirely with the relief of unemployment, they have actually got to face the problem of dealing with men who are in work, but are destitute.

"I have hundreds of complaints in my office to-day. I asked my secretary, when I was leaving home, to give me the first twenty cases on his list, and these are the figures he gave me:—

"One man worked three days last week and got 5s. 10d. to take home as his week's wage.

"Another worked three days and got 3s. 9d.

"Another worked three days and got 15s. 6d.

"Another worked three days and got 5s. 2d.

"Another worked three days and got 5s. 1d.

"Another worked three days and got 5s.

"Another worked three days and got 2s. 9d.

"Another worked three days and got 12s. 6d.

Minimum Wage Gone.

"That is the type of wage that is paid to scores of thousands of men in the Welsh coalfields. . . . As a matter of fact, the Government scrapped all the machinery we had in the industry for administering the minimum wage." Hartshorn omitted to state that men dare not claim the minimum wage.

Mr. Hartshorn did not mention the boy's wage which the miner has to pay out of his earnings. His calculation as to what the miner can provide for his family out of his earnings has the bottom knocked out of it unless the boy's wage is taken into account. But even if he has deducted the boy's wage, his figures reveal a desperate position indeed, for the unfortunate people of the mines

No More Talk of Nationalisation.

The Government and the mine owners are wholly callous. Sir Alfred Mond merely suggests an extension of the miner's working day.

The Labour Party seems asleep to the tragedy. Of its old demand for the nationalisation of the mines no more is heard. It gives its bland assent to the Government schemes to provide more capital for the capitalists, though even that hardened old Tory financier, Sir Frederick Banbury, warns them that the Government ought not to do it, and that they ought to protest. Banbury, knowing the advantages which the capitalist will derive by the deal, will, of course, see that the companies he is interested in are not left out when the £25,000,000, plundered from the taxpayers to aid the capitalists, comes to be shared out.

RAMSAY MACDONALD, THE LAW LOVER, ADVOCATES LAW BREAKING.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, if he may be judged by his utterances, is, perhaps, our strongest Constitutionalist and law lover. His line of argument, as a rule, is that we must not weaken our social sanctions by failure to obey the laws adopted by our duly elected constitutional organ, Parliament, and propounded by its constitutionally appointed Government, whose leader, as everyone knows, is appointed by the Sovereign.

Law-loving Mr Macdonald has, however, more than once advocated law-breaking in the course of his career, but he has taken care on each occasion not to countenance law-breaking unless he has been sure of a strong middle class backing.

He was a strong advocate of passive resistance to the Balfour Education Act, in the early nineties, and approved both refusal to go to school, by children and teachers, and refusal to pay for the State education by Nonconformists.

One might have thought that MacDonald had outgrown such rebellious tendencies but now he is recommending precisely similar action and even urging industrial action, which, for political purposes, he has repeatedly condemned, in opposition to the new Unemployment Insurance.

Read him as he expresses his views in the Scottish *Forward*.—

"This tax on wages is one of the most unprincipled things ever proposed, and the Trade Unions ought to take steps to resist the imposition. Employers ought to be approached at once and be informed that their workmen will not accept the deduction. I am sure that a good many will join with the workmen to resist the impost, and an arrangement should be come to for their defence if prosecutions follow. This ought to be supplemented by industrial action if need be. For there come times when the unjust action of a kept Parliamentary majority should be resisted."

Boiling hot, is it not? Mr. MacDonald will cool down very quickly though if his proposal is not widely and influentially adopted. He is not a man to back lost causes, or lead desperate ventures. We remember him on the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils which so speedily expired.

It is interesting that Mr. MacDonald should be so heatedly opposed to this latest "tax on wages," since he was a supporter of the original Insurance Act when it was introduced by Messieurs Asquith and Lloyd George. It was on account of the Insurance Act and other such legislation that Mr. MacDonald was moved to take a leading share in manœuvring the newly-elected Labour Party into becoming a mere appendage of the Liberal Government. The guiding principle of Mr. MacDonald and the others who led the Labour Party in those days was to keep the Liberal Party in power, for the sake of such legislature as this.

When the workers bring out the big guns of the general strike, as Mr. MacDonald suggests, we advise them to do it for something more important than 2d. a week.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

A blue mark in this space indicates that your subscription is now due.

Increased Postal rates and the high cost of production of the paper necessitate prompt payment.

IRELAND.

In Parliament.

Questions and answers revealed that the Sinn Fein Courts still function actively in Ireland, that people are arrested, fined and punished in various ways, including deportation, a sentence which they are ordered to carry out on their own account.

Twenty-four persons were reported as actually under Sinn Fein arrest at the present time, and, during the truce, soldiers and policemen, as well as civilians, have been kidnapped and kept under arrest. Motor cars and farm carts are commandeered, and Irish Republican soldiers are compulsorily billeted even upon unwilling people. The Republican Army has commandeered a workhouse in Donegal. A Protestant "loyalist," named Woods, was kidnapped on October 3rd, tried by Sinn Fein Court-martial and fined £20. He was informed that if the money were not paid before a certain date both he and his father would be taken next time. A Bantry bank manager named Ringwood was compelled to leave for England, and when his furniture was sold, those who attended the sale where told that his furniture was forfeit to the Republic.

Sinn Fein is levying taxes for the Irish Republican Exchequer. Printed Circulars were issued to farmers and others in East Donegal and elsewhere from the Irish Republican Army demanding sums varying from £5 to £100 for its maintenance, and stating that evasion of payment will be dealt with as the act of an enemy of the Republic.

The Sinn Fein Dail has ordered the boycott of certain firms and banks, and is issuing a black list of persons who have flouted its orders by dealing with such firms. British goods, including agricultural machinery, are being boycotted, and a German cream separator is on show at a Dublin exhibition.

Compensation to Loyalists.

The Irish local authorities are not paying to the so-called "loyalists" (anti-Sinn Feiners) the compensation for damage to their property which the British Government has decided the Irish local authorities shall raise from the ratepayers. Consequently the Government has withheld from the Irish local authorities £1,650,000 and £200,000 a year, which is due to them. These monies the Government is paying out in compensation.

As may well be imagined this has been throwing the finances of Irish local government into a state of chaos.

The Criminal Injuries (Ireland) Act, 1920, provides that rates payable by ratepayers to the County Council may, on application to the High Court, be set off against the amount due by the Council for the above-mentioned damage. Sinn Fein has warned solicitors in Ireland against instituting such proceedings, and solicitors are fearfully complying with the Sinn Fein command. Sir H. Greenwood (C.L.), British Chief Secretary, has promised the solicitors the protection of the British Crown, but the solicitors fear Sinn Fein more than they trust the British Government, or perhaps they sympathise with Sinn Fein; at any rate, they continue to obey the Sinn Fein order.

A "Dose of Lead."

Colonel Newman (C.U.) offered to send to Sir Hamar Greenwood a regulation issued by the Sinn Fein Minister of Defence "prescribing a dose of lead to anyone who makes an application for compensation."

Dial Eirann this year issued orders for a Supreme Court in Dublin district Courts, in which two out of five members may be priests, and parish Courts, in which one of five members may be priests. (The inclusion of priests in these Courts seems to us a most reactionary proceeding.) These Courts are intended to supercede the Courts held under British Government auspices.

Sir H. Greenwood (C.L.) at the beginning of the week tried to cover up the Government's powerlessness by stating that the Courts are voluntary arbitration Courts. At the end of the week he admitted that the police had received complaints of the holding of 94 such courts, and said that the British Government would not tolerate them, but to disperse them meant bloodshed, and he did not feel justified in causing that during the truce.

Sir Frederick Banbury (C.U.) attempted to move the adjournment of the House to discuss the Sinn Fein Courts, but the Speaker objected that the matter was not urgent.

Lieut.-Colonel Archer-Shee (C.U.) declared that an Official Circular to British troops in Ireland had declared gun-running in Ireland to be general and free from molestation. Sir H. Greenwood: "I am sure the hon. and gallant gentleman would not expect me to discuss the contents of any confidential orders. . . . ."

Volunteers Red or Yellow?

On the other hand, the Ulster Volunteer Force is being reorganised, but Lloyd George, although he admitted knowing this, said: "I am not aware, however, that any action has yet been taken by the promoters of the movement which could be regarded as a breach of the Government of Ireland Act."

Would he be so complacent if Red Volunteers were being organised? Perhaps if the movement were strong enough to make itself feared.

Provocation.

Sir T. Bennett (C.U.) declared that the display of Sinn Fein colours over the doorway of the house where the Irish delegation is staying is a provocation to the people of the neighbourhood. Lloyd George: "I quite agree. . . . I cannot imagine why all these follies are being perpetrated."

Such statements in Parliament, widely reported as they were in the press, seem like an invitation to foolish people to go and make trouble.

It transpired that the famous truce now supposed to be in operation was not signed by anyone.

REFORMISM.

By Henri Barbusse.

It is clear that, if in a social organism in which the ruling oligarchy holds all the means of power in its hands, measures are passed ostensibly serviceable to the commonweal, these can only be insignificant or illusory or of temporary effect, because they would otherwise be directed against the interests of this oligarchy. . . .

For the rest, facts affirm the truth of this everywhere. It is now half-a-century that France has been a Republic. If there were a grain of truth in the reformist theory, we should be witnessing an ever-widening evolution of democracy towards freedom: equality and justice would have come nearer. Yet, in the chaos of our laws and industries we find on the contrary an evolution in the opposite direction. The French Republic had the same share in the war as the other powers; still more; it even afterwards fostered the spirit of militarism and the state of war itself.

All over Europe, wherever she could obtain influence, she assisted the triumph of the principles of reaction and conservatism. Now she works for the restoration of monarchies, or what is worst still, only suffers republics that resemble monarchies. Everywhere she allies herself with the White Terror and seizes on every means for the suppression of a genuine liberation of the nations. She gave her alliance, our money and our soldiers to Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel, Horthy, to these goldlaced pirates, butchers and aristocratic scum. . . . The government of the fifty-years republic dissolves the trades unions, and on the emptiest pretexts organises the hunt after socialists with her whole rabble; she seeks to murder free thought legally with a strictness that carries us back to the dark ages, renews the once broken alliance with the Church, the systematic and sanctified embodiment of reaction, pays a lieutenant as highly as a university professor, glorifies Napoleon and canonises a clerical counterfeit of the Maid of Orleans. The organism of France is preyed upon more than ever by the cancer of the military budget whose growth, calculated soberly, allows one to predict the end of the nation's life. In reality reformism is nothing but an ingenius and picturesque organisation of social stagnation. It is the tragi-comedy of reaction.

The evil must be taken at the root in order to change things. There is only one means of bringing about the reign of true order, and that is—force. Only through force and the revolution can the absurd laws, the senselessness of a mechanical and militarised community existence and social falsehood be abolished.

—From "The Knife between the Teeth."

EMIGRATION TO SOUTH AFRICA.

Owing to the existence of the South African Miners' Phthisis Act, which provides compensation for miners who contract phthisis, no person is employed underground in South Africa who is suffering from any disease of the respiratory organs, or whose general health is not satisfactory. The medical examination is very strict. Since the Cornish pits have been closed down, numbers of miners have emigrated from Cornwall to South Africa, but many have failed to pass the medical examination on arrival, and with their families have been miserably stranded. The Cornish Miners' Association of the Transvaal has appealed for a preliminary examination in London, and has asked, in case the South African examination reverse the London decision, that the miners should nevertheless be allowed to work six months to earn his passage money home. The Minister replied that the preliminary examination in London must be at the applicant's expense, and that he could not agree to the provisional six months' certificate.

Wages are being reduced in the South African mines. The Transvaal Gold Mining Estates, Ltd., have reduced wages by 25 per cent. "The Board do not forget," said the Chairman at a company meeting, "prevailing conditions and the high cost of living, and so deduction is being made gradually." He paid a tribute to "the willingness of our men to listen to reason."

CREMONA LABOURERS.

In November, 1920, the agricultural workers of the province of Cremona, being in dispute with the landowners, the members of the Catholic trade union of the province, seized the estates and began to work them on their own account. This occupation lasted the whole of the first half of the year 1921. Finally, August 19th, 1921, an arbitration committee gave judgment instituting workers' control in the enterprises. Here are the chief items of the judgment:—

(1) The engagement of labourers shall be carried on under the control of the wage-earners.

(2) The workers sharing in the profits shall name two delegates charged with the control of the business, and to take part in the inventories and the regulation of expenditure.

(3) The employees shall share in the capital invested in the business by the farmers.

(4) Besides their wages the workers shall participate in the profits of the undertaking to the amount of 85 per cent., the rest falling to the share of the farmers, who will receive for their work in direction and administration a salary proportionate to the importance of the undertaking, and may also have free use of the houses, means of transport, etc., which exist on the lands of the concern.—*L'Exploite.*

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

"Women in the Socialist State." By Mrs. H. M. Swanwick. International Bookshops. 3s. 6d. The author's vision is of a kind of State socialism, in which there will be maintenance grants for mothers, including the cost of lodging, food, warmth and clothing, and something for the personal service she renders to her children. "The mother should be free to render it herself or pay someone else to render it. If she neglected her duties . . . the administration of the grant should be temporarily or permanently given to another person." This, in our opinion, is not socialism at all. Says Mrs. Swanwick: "In my youth I read about a variety of Utopias, and each one left me more depressed than the last . . . one wanted something ranker and racier. . . ." Quite so; that is an appropriate comment upon Mrs. Swanwick's own production. It is strange that she should be able to find it superior to Morris's "News from Nowhere," or Bellamy's "Looking Backward," to name but two of the socialist Utopias, which, like everyone else, Mrs. Swanwick must have read. We could not bear to live in Mrs. Swanwick's socialist world, which smacks of the social welfare uplifters.

But on one point Mrs. Swanwick has something to say, in which she breaks away from to-day's bourgeois conventions. She says it a little vaguely in a brief passage. Nevertheless, we welcome the courage which has led her to say that she is opposed to the legal marriage, that the need of it will disappear with the private property system, which entails providing for dependents, and that sexual unions should be a purely personal affair—at least, that is what we gather from her observations.

"Die Internationale Kommunistische Werbewoche. Schreiben des Exekutivkomittes der Kommunistischen Internationale."

"The Struggle for Power": An answer to Morris Hillquit's "From Marx to Lenin." By Albert Verkin. Price 15 cents. A useful reply to many fallacious Arguments. All these may be obtained through our Book Service.

"The Defence of Terrorism": A reply to Karl Kautsky. By L. Trotsky. The Labour Publishing Company. 3s. 6d. Trotsky makes this interesting observation: " . . . the intellectual struggle in the ranks of the working class is only now blazing up as it should . . . Kautskianism as a bourgeois attitude, as a tradition of passivity, as political cowardice, still plays an enormous part in the upper ranks of the working class organisations of the world, in no way excluding parties tending to the Third International, and even formally adhering to it!" Indeed, we thoroughly agree with this statement. Trotsky has a word of criticism for the French Longuetists, the Italian Socialist Party, the German Independents. Of Britain he says nothing. The Russians are not quite sure of their British policy, and they are not quite sure what sort of pig in a poke they have bought in the British Communist Party. Trotsky gives Kautsky an able trouncing on many points.

"Russia in 1921." By Tom Mann. 6d.

"Reds in Congress." By J. T. Murphy. 6d.

"Constitution of Red Trade Union International. 2d.

All these may be obtained from our Book Service, 152, Fleet Street.

A deputation of wives, widows, sisters and mothers of unemployed on Wednesday, November 2nd, endeavoured to see Lloyd George and force the needs of the unemployed upon his reluctant attention.

'LEFT WING' COMMUNIST MEETINGS

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5TH,
Chrisp Street and Grundy Street, 3.30 p.m. Dock Gates, Poplar, 7 p.m.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12TH,
Church Road, Camberwell, 6.30 p.m.

ON SALE NOW.

SOVIET RUSSIA
AS I SAW IT
BY E. SYLVIA PANKHURST

TWO SHILLINGS and SIXPENCE.

From "WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" OFFICE,
152, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.

III.

(Continued from our last issue).

In 1840 the Chartist leaders, Collins and Lovett, emerging from prison, adopted a more moderate programme. The second London Convention, held in April and May, 1842, and the rejection of the Second National Petition were followed by the turn-out of August, 1842. On August 4th, the factory hands at Ashton in Lancashire struck work, and their lead was followed in the textile districts of Lancashire and Yorkshire.

On August 7th, a great meeting on Mottram Moor resolved that all work should cease until the Charter became the law of the land. From Lancashire the strike spread southwards through the pottery towns and the Staffordshire coal fields. On August 16th, a Trade Conference assembled at Manchester voted a general strike for the Charter, and if this failed, an appeal to arms. The Chartist organisation issued a sympathetic resolution in the name of the executive committee.

As in 1839, there followed disturbances, riots and arrests. Thus ended the second chapter of the Chartist movement.

The third phase of the Chartist movement is but a record of disintegration.

The National Chartist Association became the National Land Company, engaging in land projects similar to Owen's New Harmony.

In 1848, enthused by the revolution in France, the Chartist Movement again showed signs of life. It changed back into a political organisation and arranged a convention to present a National Petition to Parliament. On April 10th a procession was held, and then the petition was carried by the executive to Parliament. The entire affair ended in a fiasco.

While many internal factors had contributed to the failure of the Chartist movement, division in its leadership as to the use of physical or moral force; frequent changes of attack from industrial to political fields, etc., were but factors common to all working-class movements of the time—factors which merely indicated the immaturity of these movements.

There was, however, a more fundamental cause—the free-trade agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws.

In 1838 the Anti-Corn Law League was formed, and for the next eight years, until the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, the free-trade agitation forced all other movements into the background

The Chartist movement was succeeded shortly afterwards, 1848, by a new wave of revolution throughout the Continent. Here, again, the working masses came to the foreground for a time. This was especially true in France, where a workers' party—the Mountain—actually held the State power for a brief period. But the erstwhile "revolutionary bourgeoisie" fled into the fold of the Royalists, whose aid they solicited in crushing the proletarian movement.

As Marx stated:

"All classes and parties joined hands in the June days in a 'Party of Order' against the class of the proletariat, which was designated as the 'Party of Anarchism, of Socialism, of Communism.'"

Thus ended the proletarian activity for the first half of the nineteenth century—feverish, impetuous; as yet but half conscious of its own aims; its power as yet latent; its class-conscious solidarity as yet but a dream.

As a result of these activities, the working masses became disillusioned with all the old traditions. They learned, in the words of Marx, that "the social revolution of the nineteenth century cannot draw its poetry from the past, it can draw that only from the future; that it cannot start upon its work before it has stricken off all superstition concerning the past."

Now set in a period of patient organisation and enligtenment, which was to bear fruit in 1871.

(To be continued.)

"Dreadnought" Development Fund.

MONEY URGENTLY NEEDED!

A Sympathiser (per Mrs. Cahill) 2s. 6d., J. Leakey £1 1s., W. Watson 2s. 6d., Dr. Eedes How £1, Mrs. E. £2, C. T. George 1s. 9d. Total, £4 7s. 6d.

THE UNEMPLOYED AT A TOWN'S MEETING.

Some remarkable statements were made at a Southwark Town's Meeting, held on the demand of the local unemployed.

A spokesman for the local unemployed organisation complained of callous treatment by the local Board of Guardians, and the following cases were cited:

Man unemployed, wife expecting confinement, rent 14/-, no income: no grant from Board.

Man with dependent mother, no income: no grant.

Man unemployed, no income, rent 5/-: no gant.

Man with wife and children, income 8/-, rent 8/-: grant 5/- cash, 2/- in kind.

No income, rent 5/-: no grant.

Wife and one child, disability pension 10/-: grant 4/- in food.

Man 50 years of age, lost room through inability to pay rent, no income: no grant.

Shopkeepers were unwilling to receive the food tickets issued by the Guardians; all butchers had refused, and unemployed had to stand in queues outside the two grocers who were willing to accept the tickets. Cheese was charged 1/3 on the tickets, but could be had for 1/- and 1/2 in the shop.

The Labour Mayor, Mr. Isaacs, expressed willingness to investigate the charges made and to call a conference between the Council and Board of Guardians.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Evans, who had assisted in the original organising of the unemployed in Southwark, alleged that they had captured premises, which they had named "Poverty Hall."

The Mayor had then asked the unemployed to confer with him, and had told a deputation: "If you'll chuck out those Red Flaggers, I've enough food in the Town Hall to last you six weeks."

The Mayor here interjected: "It's not true!"

Mr. Evans: "It is."

The Mayor: "I challenge that statement."

Cries from the audience: "We all know it's true!"

An agreed resolution moved by a Labour, a Progressive, and a Moderate member of the Council, asking for work or adequate maintenance as a national charge, was amended by the inclusion of a demand for work or maintenance at "full Trade Union rates." Resolutions were also carried, demanding the resignation of the Council, since it had failed to deal with the situation, and calling upon the workers to set up Soviets, on the ground that unemployment will never be ended until the capitalist system is abolished.

A CHALLENGE TO THE "COMMUNIST."

The Third and Fourth Internationals.

Says the *Communist*:—

"We have been asked something about the proposed Fourth International. We should have preferred to leave the movers of this project to speak for themselves, as nothing is to be gained by spending much time and space upon it."

We quite understand that the *Communist* should prefer to ignore the Fourth International: where the arguments against a proposition are weak, the boycott becomes a stronger weapon! We agree that the Parliamentarians have nothing to gain by a discussion of tactics between ourselves and them.

The *Communist* continues:—

"The project has arisen from the Communist Labour Party of Germany" [this should be Communist Workers' Party] "a small party of the 'Infantile Left.'"

The Communist Workers' Party of Germany (K.A.P.D.) actually numbers between 70,000 and 80,000 members; so the Communist Party in this country cannot reproach it on the score of its size; but principles are not measured by numbers!

The *Communist* further says that the K.A.P.D.

"has always had an erratic history, and in its early days was mixed up with the national Bolshevism, or patriotic Bolshevism of Laufenburg."

Laufenburg, it is true, was a member of the K.A.P.D., but at the first conference after its formation, the K.A.P.D. repudiated his theories. The KA.P.D. is at present repudiating the patriotism of its rival Third International Communist Party, the K.P.D., which is advocating a patriotic struggle for the German bourgeois republic against the Allies.

The *Communist* at length comes to the point:

"Its later differences with the Third International have concerned the use of the Parliamentary platform for propaganda, and work within the existing Trade Unions. In both of these questions the Party takes the Simon Pure revolutionary attitude."

Thus the *Communist* admits that this is the correct uncompromising "pure" attitude for revolutionaries to take. The contemptuous epithet, "Simon Pure," does not matter.

The *Communist* adds:—

"It is quite possible to disagree with particular rulings of the International on special questions, such as Parliamentary action, etc. . . . but an individual may honestly hold such a view and hope that the International may reverse its decision, which he accepts in the meantime. But if, as soon as any subordinate disagreement arises, he chooses to break away, that is an end of the International . . . the questions of Trade Union policy and the use of Parliamentarism are minor questions, dependent on circumstances. . . ."

Such remarks are quite out of keeping with the fact that the Editor of this paper was expelled from the Communist Party for editing a paper opposed to Parliamentarism and the Labour Party affiliation, they are inconsistent with the expulsion of members of the Party for selling the *Workers' Dreadnought*. Moreover, the refusal, by the Third International majority, to permit the affiliation of the K.A.P.D., on account of its anti-Parliamentary and revolutionary policy, shows that the Right majority desires to prevent the Left minority from converting the International to its view.

The *Communist* further states that the criticisms of affairs in Soviet Russia, which are to be found in some of the newspapers of the Fourth International, are the same as "the attacks and calumnies" to be found in the Right Wing Socialist papers This is incorrect.

A Challenge.

The Editor of the *Workers' Dreadnought* is prepared to debate the policy of the Third and Fourth Internationals with the Editor of the *Communist*, or any speaker whom the Communist Party may nominate, either in the columns of the two papers, or at a public meeting to be held on a mutually agreed date, either in London or the provinces.

We hereby formally issue this challenge to the *Communist* and the Communist Party of Great Britain.

GERMANY WILL CAPTURE BRITAIN'S TRADE.

Remarkable Statement by General Smuts.

According to the South African Dutch paper, the *Volkstem*, General Smuts declared that South Africa would now do a bigger trade with Germany than with Britain. This would come about, not because the South Africans would prefer it, but because economic conditions would enforce it. Britain's trade would fall off, and Germany's trade would increase, not only with South Africa, but with other parts of the British Empire.

The *Volkstem* also quotes General Smuts as saying that his followers and the South African Nationalists are being drawn closer together; each appreciating the other's good points.

If this statement is genuine, it would seem that Smuts is determined that South African Capitalism shall not be handicapped in its business by any kindness or forbearance towards the mother country, and that they shall by no means be involved in her financial embarrassments. That does not distress us: we wish to see the close corporation of the British Empire broken asunder, because its unity makes it a strong bulwark of Capitalism which must be overthrown.

Workers' Dreadnought
FOUNDED 1914.
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor
Business Communications to the Manager:
Workers' Dreadnought, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.
TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 7240.

SUBSCRIPTION:
THREE MONTHS (13 weeks) ... Post Free 3/3
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ... „ „ 6/6
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ... „ „ 13/-

Vol. VIII. No. 34. Saturday, Nov. 5, 1921.

WAR WITH IRELAND?

Labour Party Support?

If war is declared on Ireland, will the Labour Party support the Government and the war?

This is what everyone in the Labour Movement must seriously ask to-day. The statements of Arthur Henderson and J. R. Clynes in the House of Commons, on October 31st, strongly infer that the Government can count on such support, if the policy of these men remains dominant.

Incredible as this statement appears, we ask our readers to consider it carefully, to remember the record of the Labour leaders, especially that of Henderson and Clynes, during the late war, and to analyse with the greatest possible attention the speeches of Lloyd George and Henderson and Clynes in the Unionist Vote of Censure debate last Monday

Lloyd George Threatens War.

Take first these passages from Lloyd George's speech :—

" If the Southern Parliament did not come into existence, there was something in the nature of Crown Colony government to be set up; then the powers were to be conferred simultaneously upon the Crown Colony and the Ulster Parliament. . . .

" Therefore, unless something happens in the course of the next few days, one way or another, that puts the position right from the point of view of the Act, we shall either exercise the powers we have got—and in that matter we are obtaining the opinion of the Attorney-General—or confer the necessary powers on the Northern Parliament, or ask the House of Commons during the present Session to pass a short Act dealing with the matter. . . .

" If this conference is broken off, and it might, I am not asking the House to face anything which someone at this box may not be inviting you to face in a few days, but I want the House to face it squarely. . . . You have to surround them, hunt down small elusive bands over very considerable tracts of territory, a good deal of it over highly difficult mountainous country, where the population is entirely in sympathy with the guerrillas. . . .

" We all know how gigantic were the forces that had to be put into Africa to accomplish our task.

" If it has to be done, and if the people of this country are convinced that it must be done, it can be done, and will be done."

" I cannot conceal the possibility that I may have to make this grave announcement—that it is impossible to settle without danger of dishonour.

" If the security of the country is menaced if the Throne is repudiated;

" If this Empire is to be mutilated and Ireland established as an alien country, so that she is free to make war on our commerce;

" And British commerce is to be liable to attack on the Irish coast without any right for Britain to use the shores of Ireland for its defence;

" If Ireland walks off with her freedom, leaving Britain staggering along under her burden, which Ireland joined in incurring . . .

" If an arrangement is insisted upon which means that the fires of civil war are to rage at our doors between Catholics and Protestants, while we look on—then Great Britain, I feel confident, will take the necessary risks. . . ."

A Re-Hash of the Old Terms.

This statement seems to mean that unless Sinn Fein agree, at least, to the following propositions, the Lloyd Geoge Government will enforce Crown Colony government (which means the abolition of all forms of representative government) in Ireland, and make war on the population of Ireland :—

(1) *Ireland to remain in the British Empire;*

(2) *British Navy to control Ireland and its coasts.*

(3) *Free Trade between the two countries: Ireland to be debarred from making commercial or other Treaties with foreign countries;*

(4) *Ireland to shoulder the share of the British War Debt apportioned to her by the British Government;*

(5) *The partition of Ireland.*

The phrases in the Prime Minister's speech of October 31st, imply no change in the terms already offered by his Government to Ireland in August, and then emphatically rejected by Sinn Fein on Ireland's behalf.

Capitalist Press gossips say that no progress whatsoever has been made by the Downing Street conference, and no avenue of agreement discovered in any direction. Lloyd George's speech strongly confirms that view. Indeed, it is remarkably like a preparation for war.

Henderson's Statement.

Let us turn now to the speech of Henderson

He, of course, spoke ostensibly as a member of the opposition, of an opposition that had received very serious rebuffs on the Unemployment Bill a day or two before. He blamed the Government—it is popular to do so—for having tried to settle the Irish question by force. He also deprecated the partition of Ireland: the Liberals do that whilst prepared to assent to it. Then he said :—

" We are prepared to trust those who are carrying on the negotiations. When the time comes to examine their proposals we shall apply certain tests :—

" (1) Whether the proposals satisfy the majority of the Irish people. . . .

" (2) Having regard to the long religious difficulty, there must be some form of protection for the minority.

" (3) We shall examine the position from the standpoint of the security of our own country."

In political parlance (at which Mr. Henderson is an adept; in the House of Commons he deals in no other) the two latter passages mean :

(2) weighting the scales in the Unionist favour to give their small minority as much power as Sinn Fein Ireland's great majority : a proposition to which it is unlikely Sinn Fein will agree;

(3) Retaining Ireland within the Empire and keeping her under British naval and military control. Probably the commercial stipulations made by Lloyd George are also included. This knocks the bottom out of the Sinn Fein demands and is in line with the Government attitude which is creating the probability of war with Ireland.

Clynes, who spoke later in the debate, spoke more than once of retaining Ireland within the Empire, as though that were an unchangeable factor.

There seems no doubt that official Labour is prepared to support the British Government in opposition to an Irish Republic.

At first the Labour Party, whilst refusing to declare for the Irish, might attempt to remain neutral on the question of war; but when war is in progress, all who work must help or hinder, and official Labour would soon be giving the Government open assistance. This view is confirmed by Henderson's many statements on this question. When Sinn Fein rejected the Lloyd George Government's terms in August, Henderson stated that it was a pity Sinn Fein had not accepted them; he made no criticism of the terms, nor has he since done so. On October 22nd, speaking at Portsmouth, Henderson said: " If the Irish Conference does break down, it will be no justification for plunging this country into an immediate General Election."

Those words must mean, if Mr. Henderson is to be taken as a serious person at all, that, in his view, the Lloyd George Government's policy towards Ireland is the correct and, indeed, the only policy, otherwise he would necessarily call for a General Election *before the commencement of war with Ireland*, in order that the electors might at least be given the opportunity of reversing the Government's policy.

Is This the Labour Party Policy?

It is only too clear that Mr. Henderson's Irish policy is identical, or practically identical, with that of Lloyd George.

Is the policy of Henderson the policy of the Labour Party? That is a question of tremendous importance to-day.

The Labour Party has failed completely on this, as on many other occasions, to justify its existence. Its leaders continue to make it a mere echo of the capitalist parties on all broad issues, differing merely in minor details.

On September 9th, the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress and the Executive of the Labour Party declared its opposition to war with Ireland; yet the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party passed the resolution quoted by Arthur Henderson, stating that there must be security for Great Britain; a stupid phrase which, owing to the political implications that have been attached to it, shuts the door to Irish Independence.

The *Daily Herald* professes to stand for Irish Independence and peace with Ireland. In its leader it made no reference to Henderson's speech: in its news columns it approved it. Where does the *Herald* stand?

If the sympathy which the Labour Party has professed with the Irish people were genuine, Henderson, as the Party spokesman would have announced that *if the Conference should break down and the Government attempt war upon Ireland, the Labour Party would offer its most determined opposition, and would instruct its members to refuse all work connected with transport to and from Ireland, and supplies to the British Army and Navy, as a preliminary to any more drastic action that might prove necessary to stop the commencement of hostilities.*

If the Labour Party were sincere in its professions towards Ireland, it would have instructed Mr. Henderson to declare (indeed, it would have done so long ago) that it stands for the complete independence of Ireland and the maintenance of the Irish Republic.

The Labour Party leaders are mere followers of the capitalist party leaders and of the varying winds of public opinion; they are sailing without chart or compass after the will-o'-the-wisp—success.

Those members of the Labour Party and the Trade Union movement who sincerely oppose war with Ireland and who genuinely desire Ireland's independence and the maintenance of her Republic, should demand the immediate summoning of a joint Conference of the Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party, to decide what official Labour's policy is towards Ireland (at present, Labour has no policy) and to prepare plans of ACTION TO PREVENT THE IRISH WAR.

Those who realise that the British official Labour movement cannot be moved to such action will endeavour to stir up the rebel sections of the rank and file to take what steps are necessary and possible, without waiting for official instructions.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

Read Tom Mann's Booklet
RUSSIA IN 1921.
JUST OUT.
SIXPENCE - - - *Post free 7d.*
In any quantities from the R.I.L.U. office, 4/- per dozen, carriage extra, 8, Wellington Street, Strand, W.C.2.

GERMAN ONE BIG REVOLUTIONARY UNION.

Programme and Rules of the "Allgemeine Arbeiter Union" of Germany, or General Workers' Union, a Revolutionary Workshop Organisation.

I.

Capital has moved since the war in an uninterrupted and continually advancing crisis.

It seeks to stay its bankruptcy by striving at international trustification, through commercial amalgamation of capital in the victorious, as well as in the conquered countries, for the purpose of a united holding down and more intense exploitation of the proletariat by Capitalism.

The Parliamentary governing machine—outstripped by the economic development—falls to pieces in this process. Capital has already begun to create, internationally, political machinery adapted to its changed economic conditions.

In face of this, the proletariat must unite as a class and fight in an organised fashion, by tactical methods closely connected with the basis of production. The workshops, which correspond to the development of class-consciousness in the workers, alone can can form the starting-point for the final struggle to take over production and to seize political power.

Such unity has come about through the necessity of the revolutionary process, in the shape of the " Allgemeine Arbiter-Union."

II.

The A.A.U. is a union in the workshops of the proletariat as a class, for the purpose of fighting the capitalist economic system, with the immediate object: Conquest of the means of production, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is also the present embodiment of the organisational principle of Communist society. Communist society is based on the system of production on a common principle for use, and is built up according to the Soviet system.

III.

The Soviet system is the organisational form which corresponds to the method of common production. The gradual realisation of the Soviet system as a revolutionary process is the thermometer of the proletarian progress in class-consciousness. The progress of the A.A.U. is the thermometer for the ripening of the new society.

IV.

The A.A.U. rejects, on principle, every kind of reformist and opportunist, Parliamentary Trade Union politics, especially participation in Parliament, in official workshop councils and conciliatory methods, these being incompatible with the actual necessities of the class-struggle in the situation which has developed since the world war.

V.

The A.A.U. recognises in the old Trade Unions one of the main bulwarks of the counter-revolution. They are organisational forces of a pre-revolutionary period, and as such are incapable of the revolutionary struggle. The demolition of the Trade Unions is an historic necessity in the interest of the proletarian revolution.

The A.A.U. opposes the cell-tactic, the object of which, the conquest of the Trade Unions, is an illusion. The champions of the cell-tactic force their adherents into subjection to the counter-revolutionary fighting methods of the Trade Unions. Therefore the A.A.U. rejects the Red Trade Union International and opposes all the organisations affiliated thereto.

VI.

The A.A.U. rejects Syndicalism, especially its unhistoric method of thinking, its petty-bourgois attitude towards the necessities of the class-struggle, its veiled rejection of the political struggle, the separate political organisation, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

VII.

The A.A.U. wages war against all Parliamentary parties, which, as bourgeois structures, are doomed to collapse.

The A.A.U., however, stands for the uniting of the most advanced revolutionary proletarians in a separate political organisation of purely proletarian-Communist character. It thereby recognises the political organisations united in the Communist Workers' International as necessary to the class-struggle.

VIII.

The A.A.U. is in close touch, in fighting union, with the political organisations referred to in paragraph 7. The organisational independence of the Union remains thereby untouched.

IX.

The A.A.U. strives for the international alliance of organisations that adopt the objects and fighting methods of the A.A.U.

X.

The immediate objects of the A.A.U. are :—

1.—The revolutionising of the workshops by propaganda and action.

2.—The promotion of partial strikes, general strikes, and workshop struggles of every kind that have a Communist aim.

The methods of the proletarian struggle are: strike, revolt, passive resistance, occupation of the workshops, and systematic sabotage.

3.—Active participation in every revolutionary action, national and international.

4.—Struggle by propaganda and action for revolutionary workshop committees.

5.—Closest unity and solidarity of action with the unemployed, through revolutionary committees.

6.—Furtherance of the responsibility for action, instead of a policy of giving out watchwords, through developing self-consciousness.

THE COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY.

(Continued).

The Immediate Political Effects of the Policy of the Soviet Government.

Capitalism has, besides the object of industrialising, another historic aim, namely, the creation of the great masses of those who have to place their labour power for wages at the disposal of capital—the proletariat. Capitalism creates the distinction of classes in society, the division into the two irreconcilable classes: the bourgeoisie and proletariat. Capitalism produces class antagonisms and the class-struggle between capital and the working class.

The introduction of Capitalism in Russia, as it is now inaugurated by the Soviet Government, must be attended with the same class division, the same class struggle:

" Freedom of turnover means freedom of commerce, but freedom of commerce means a return to Capitalism. Freedom of turnover and freedom of commerce mean exchange of commodities between individual small farmers. We all know, if we understand the A.B.C. of Marxism, that from this free turnover and free commerce arises the division of the producers of commodities into owners of capital and owners of labour-power, the division into capitalists and wage-workers, that is to say, the re-introduction of capitalist wage-slavery.

With the recognition of the demands of the peasantry, in the way of free production and free commerce and the foreign political concessions, the Soviet Government has ceased to be a Soviet Government, that is to say, a Government of the proletariat. No man can serve two masters; it is an impossibility to be at the same time political leader of the bourgeoisie and of the proletariat.

The Russian proletariat has, in that way, already lost control of its State. The Soviet Government has fallen a victim to its own policy. The Soviet Russia of the Russian peasants changes into the Soviet Russia of the Russian peasants and the Russian bourgeoisie. The Soviet Government, compelled by economic conditions, becomes, therefore, itself a representative of Capitalism.

We are not, with the best of intentions, capable of the fantastic ingenuity of the *Rote Fahne* (" Red Flag "), which unblushingly declares, in all sincerity, that here " a highly paradoxical aspect appeared in the final crisis of Capitalism the bourgeoisie must help its class enemy."

The Soviet Government is, on the contrary, forced by international capital into the role of champion of its interests in the way of profits, and is thus compelled to assume a hostile attitude towards the proletariat, just as the German Government is. World capital aims at making Soviet Russia, like Germany, a branch concern for the realisation of profits. To consider world capital capable ofsuch stupidity as to help a class enemy, as the U.K.P.D. (United Communist Party of Germany) does is to become the jester of capitalist society.

The capitalist penetration of Soviet Russia through world-capital, which is now setting in, with the most active aid on the part of the Soviet Government, not only means the end of Soviet Russia as a proletarian State, but at the same time also provides fresh enormous facilities for world capital towards the surmounting of its crisis, and places new tremendous difficulties and obstacles in the way of the proletarian world revolution. That, and nothing else, is the inevitable effect.

The Soviet Government must become a Government in opposition to the Russian working class, having openly taken sides with the bourgeoisie. The Soviet Government is the Communist Party of Russia. Thus the Communist Party of Russia has become an antagonist of the working class, because it champions, as Soviet Government, the interests of the bourgeoisie at the expense of the proletariat. This state of affairs will not prevail long; the Communist Party of Rusia will be split.

Also, the Trade Unions in Russia, to-day almost without animation, but, numerically, tremendous organisations, will have to be split before they are able to have new life instilled into them.

When the Trade Unions, under economic pressure, are split like the Communist Party, they will most likely consist of three departments: organisational and functionaries' departments, which will, as to-day, remain affiliated as State-labour Departments to the Russian State: a second part of the workers will unite economically in similar organisations to those of the West European Trade Unions, and will pursue the struggle against the selling of labour-power too cheaply, but not against the sale of labour-power altogether. The remainder will unite in a revolutionary organisation, with revolutionary proletarian weapons. Owing to the class antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, which, in the large towns, has become acute, and is still further aggravated by recent events, quite new, independent structures of organisation of the Rusian proletariat will develop. These, in respect of the structure of organisation, tactic and aim, will be much more advanced than the present Communist Party of Russia, and in course of time, in its entire aspect, will come to approach the Communist Workers Party and the General Workers' Union of Germany. They will go far beyond the merely oppositional tactic of the present Russian Workers' Opposition and assume a pronounced proletarian revolutionary character.

(to be continued)

MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

For Embroidery
SOVIET ARMS TRANSFERS.
Excellent quality, will not crack.
2d. A SHEET.
Containing two copies of the Arms, one 4 in., the other 2¾ in. in width.
Embroider the Soviet Arms on your blouses, handkerchiefs, cushions and collecting bags.
Additional sizes to order.

PARLIAMENT AS WE SEE IT.

Food Ministry.

Eight hundred and ninety-one persons are still employed in the Food Control Department. Since April 1st they have liquidated stocks amounting to £30,000. Their salaries cost £20,000 a month. The Food Ministry's accounts are expected to be completed by 1922, when the payment of this £20,000 a month will cease.

Unemployment.

The callousness of the Government and the capitalists, the weakness of the Labour Party, were strikingly evident in the unemployment debates. The second reading of the Bill to give 5s. a week to the wives of unemployed men, and 1s. a week to each of their children up to a maximum of 4s. during 26 weeks, was carried by 226 votes to 70.

Trade Union Rates Refused.

The Bill immediately went into Committee. Niel MacLean's amendment to strike out the existing money provisions, and to substitute payments to the unemployed equivalent to their trade union rates of wages, to be provided entirely by the Treasury, was then negatived without a division. The Minister of Labour, Dr. Macnamara (C.L.), declared the proposal "perfectly hopeless." Not a single member of the Labour Party had the courage to speak for it, so spiritless are they! Niel MacLean has shown himself unquestionably the best of the bunch.

Agricultural Labourers and Domestic Servants

It was pointed out that agricultural labourers and large numbers of women are outside the Insurance Acts altogether, and that there is more unemployment in agriculture than in any other industry. The Government reply was simply that when employment was good the agricultural workers had not shown any great desire to be insured, and that the women could always go into domestic service. Lady Astor, who made, on the whole, a silly and superficial speech, said that the women are not suitable for domestic service and must be trained.

The Widow.

She had the good sense, however, to point out, as others also did, that the unemployed woman who is supporting an invalid husband and children only gets a maximum of 12s. plus 4s. a week, while a unemployed man breadwinner gets 15s. plus 5s. plus 4s. Eventually the Government agreed to allow such a woman 12s. plus 5s. plus 4s., but whilst allowing a widower 5s. for his housekeeper, the Minister of Labour did not make the same concession to the widow, who frequently has to pay more than that for putting her youngest child out to nurse. Lady Astor forgot that point, and the voice of Mrs. Wintringham was not raised in the debate.

The Government's wretched measure only proposes to allocate £6,000,000, to extend the unemployment insurance benefit, and of this sum the State will contribute only £2,538,000. Yet this tiny grant was meanly haggled over, in spite of the fact that £8,000,000 a day was spent in the latter stages of the war, that £320,000,000 a year is being paid in interest on war loan, that the Government gave £3,000,000 to help the British Dyes and Cellulose companies.

Workers help Workless.

Compare the grudging aid of the Government with the fact that in the 12 months ending September 30th nine of the large trade unions paid £4,267,119 in unemployment benefit. The South Wales miners till recently were levying themselves 7s. 6d. per member per week for the unemployed, and other unions have paid levys of 3s., 2s. 6d., 1s. 6d. and 1s. a week. Some have imposed a capital levy of £1 per head.

Will the Scheme be Solvent?

Considering such large sums raised by the workers themselves for their unemployed comrades, one sees how ridiculously small is the Government proposal. Members alleged that the Bill had been drafted without actuarial calculations, and it would appear that the scheme will probably be bankrupt before the six months end.

In spite of the smallness of the Government proposal the well-to-do regarded it jealously: "I intensely dislike the entire system of Government unemployment benefit," said Sir S. Hoare (C.U.). Like many more he prefers that the unemployed should be spurred by complete destitution to work on any terms.

Barnes stands up for Capitalist.

G. N. Barnes, still classed as a Labour representative, adopted the capitalist standpoint. He said that the men who have got work must think themselves lucky, and be glad to contribute to the unemployed. "Therefore," he said, "it is not from the point of view of the worker that I regard this Bill as faulty, but from the point of view of industry as a whole, which is heavily saddled at the present moment with taxation." He urged the workers to produce more, telling them that the employers would no longer take advantage of them as they did in the bad old days when he was young. Now, he said: "We have managed to supply the collective principle; we have the power to apply commonsense." Evidently he shuts his eyes to the tragic exploitation of the workers which is going on in South Wales and other places to-day.

Barnes then opposed additional benefit for single men which had been advocated by Colonel Penry Williams, a mere Coalition Liberal.

More Capital for Capitalists.

The Labour Party has looked complacently upon the Government proposal to provide more capital for the capitalists, and formally announced that it would give a "general support to the measure," instead of pressing for common ownership of the concerns which are now obliged to come back to the people for the means of development. The trade facilities scheme, as it is called, will lead to tremendous jobbery, of course, and the Government, to shield itself from the inevitable scandal which will arise, has decided to appoint a committee of influential men in the money-making world, in order that the various biggest interests may fight for the plunder amongst themselves, and keep the jobbery quiet according to the code of "honour amongst thieves." It was left to the free Liberals to move an amendment giving the committee advisory powers only, and making the Government actually responsible. The Government felt itself forced to accept this proposal.

Attack on Trades Disputes Act.

Sir Frederick Banbury (C.U.), in the course of the debate, made the sinister proposal, not merely that the Trade Boards should be abolished, but that the Trade Disputes Act should also be repealed. That would mean that picketing in strikes would virtually cease to be legal, and we should have wholesale imprisonments of the workers in every lock-out and strike. Banbury further pressed for the reduction of taxation and of the death duties. The Banbury policy is now in the ascendent; he and his kind will probably get what they desire.

Great Leap in Prices.

Tom Myers, a careful man with figures, but, as he would doubtless say, "No Bolshevik," and a sadly tame fellow, drew attention to the enormous rise in prices. Iron exports cost £11 a ton in 1913, but £40 in 1920; coal exports 14s. a ton in 1913, £4 in 1920; cotton piece goods exports 3d. per yard in 1913, 1s. 6d. in 1920. Over 75 per cent. of the firms in the cotton industry had written up the value of their property three to seven times its pre-war value. Cotton yarn exports in 1913 were 1s. 6d. per lb., in 1920 6s. 6d. per lb. In consequence, Lancashire was now exporting textile machinery to other parts of the world whilst there was a slump in Lancashire cotton.

Two Jewish Tories each dropped a few words of truth into the discussion. Samuel Samuel said: "The proposal of these loans is purely political, and is simply brought for the purpose of pretending to do something for unemployment." A. M. Samuel said that certain people are shipping cotton thread and yarn to Prague and Bohemia, where the exchange value of money is low, and where the ill-paid spinners turn it into textiles, which are sent back and keep Lancashire workers idle.

Jack Mills and Communism.

Attempts were unsuccessfully made to secure a Government pledge that part of the £25,000,000 might be sent to Russia. Jack Mills (Lab.) spoke: "As one who has spoken against the Communist theory of Government and will continue to speak against it."

Amendment to Bar Capitalist Concerns.

W. Graham (Lab.) moved to leave the private capitalist concern out of the trade facilities scheme, and to confine it to local authorities, co-operatives, and colonial and foreign governments. But when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir R. Horne (C.U.), replied that he wanted to exclude no one, as his great eagerness was to provide work, Mr. Graham obligingly withdrew his amendment. Meanwhile Morgan Jones, the new Labour representative of Caerphilly, was pleading for the small local authority in districts where unemployment is great, and declaring that such authorities would get nothing, because all the money would be given out to the big firms.

No Treasury Supervision.

Tom Shaw (Nat.) tried to secure Treasury supervision for concerns that get a share of the Government credits, but capitalism, through its spokesman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would not tolerate such interference, and Shaw blandly withdrew.

Wedgwood protested, but presently withdrew his own proposal to put a Government nominee on the Board of Directors; there is something wonderfully clannish about these business men!

A Protest by Clynes.

October 26th saw an extraordinary thing; a protest by J. R. Clynes, who walked out of the Chamber followed by other Labour Members. There was reason enough in the Government's callous attitude to rouse even the most slavish to rebel, but we fancy there was more in the matter than appeared on the surface. We believe there was an understanding, either expressed or implied, that in return for the Labour Party support of the Trade Facilities Bill some concessions would be made to the Labour Party on the Unemployed Workers Dependants (Temporary Provision) Bill. As it fell out, however, the Labour Party was met on every point by the cool statement that their proposals were either impossible or out of order.

The Labour amendment to substitute "dependants" for "wife and dependent children," in order that mothers and other persons supported by the unemployed worker, might benefit, was declared out of order.

All attempts to increase the scale of benefit were met with the statement that since the money resolution had been passed by the House, the funds to be distributed could not be added to.

Wife's 10s. Refused.

Neil MacLean (Lab.) moved to give 10s. to the wife instead of 5s. Dr. Macnamara (C.L.) replied that as the State contribution could not now be increased, the cost would fall on the workers and employers, and it would be £4,400,000. G. N. Barnes majesterially decided, however, to vote for the amendment, having heard the speeches, though he had "been inclined to vote against it for the reasons given by the Minister of Labour." Only 92 men were found to vote for the amendment. Lady Astor and Mrs. Wintringham, two cowardly capitalist party servants, who wish to pose as advanced women, were absent from the divisions on unemployment.

Child's 5s. Refused.

Neil MacLean then moved to give the first child 7s. 6d., and 5s. each for all the others, instead of the 1s. each for the first four children dictated by the Bill.

J. R. Clynes then said that if the Ministry intended to adhere to the statement that there could be no variation of money benefits: "*it appears to me it would be an act of futility and an act of disloyalty to those we represent outside this House if we took any part in the committee stage.*"

Clynes, however, did not withdraw at this juncture; another incident was to take place first, and other Labour Members actually took the initiative in departing.

Child's 2s. Refused.

Neil MacLean was appealed to by both Liberals and Labour Members to withdraw his motion in favour of one by Jack Jones (Lab.) to make the child's allowance 2s. a week, and to abolish the limitation to four children. Finally, MacLean agreed to withdraw his amendment, though Dr. Macnamara would give no undertaking to accept that of Jones, but when MacLean attempted to withdraw there were some shouts of "No." The Chairman therefore refused leave to withdraw, and immediately declared the amendment negatived. Though a division was challenged, the Chairman said he had not heard the challenge, and declared that Jack Jones's amendment could not be moved.

Will Thorne (Lab.) shouted: "You are a lot of political tricksters," and Jack Jones added: "We took you for gentlemen." The Chairman ordered them to either withdraw these remarks or to leave the Chamber; they left the Chamber.

Neil MacLean Walks out.

Neil MacLean had an amendment down to abolish the limitation of the weekly rate of 9s. He said: "I intend to move nothing further on the committee stage; I am sick of the proceedings." He attempted to explain his reasons, but the Chairman objected that he was not entitled to make a speech.

Neil MacLean thereupon walked out, and shortly afterwards Henderson, Clynes, and Sexton followed. Finally, most of the Labour Members left.

Major Barnes (C.U.) moved to let the State bear the whole of the burden, and abolish contributions by employer and employed, but secured only 19 supporters in the division. Major Gray (C.U.) unsuccessfully moved to exempt from contributions workers not employed more than four days a week. Macnamara would not exempt even those who have but two days work.

Dr. Macnamara, by a new amendment, secured power to himself to reduce the benefits if it appears to him that the scheme does not pay.

Mr. Broad (C.L.) moved to abulish the 4s. maximum, and let every child get its weekly shilling. Macnamara refused to accept it. A. Williams (Lib.), Sir R. Adkins (C.L.), Sir D. Maclean (Lib.), Sir W. Cheyne (C.U.), to prevent infant mortality. J. W. Wilson (Lib.), Sir Watson Rutherford (C.U.), and D. Cowan (C.L.), all begged the Minister to do the little thing for the little children: it was such a very little thing, and would cost such a tiny, sum that their hearts were really quite melted.

Dr. Macnamara said he would consider the matter; "*if this proposal were carried there would be no limit to the number of children. I do not say I shall go that length. I may make a proposal of a different character,*" he said.

After that there was much discussion as to whether a man would or should get an allowance on behalf of a woman with whom he was "living in sin"—[Oh, these hypocrite!]—and whether, as Colonel Nall (U.) and Mr. A. Williams (Lib.) feared, a man might claim 5s. a week for his wife, and 5s. a week for another woman having charge of his children," and any number of 5s. for maid servants looking after the children.

The folly of the discussion when 9s. a week, including children's benefits, is the maximum to be paid appeared to escape observation. Some Members were afraid that a man might invite a woman to live with him purely to get the princely 5s.!

Kenworthy moved to let the 1s. be paid to children at school up to 16 years, instead of 14; but Macnamara was adamant.

Progressive Scotland!

Poor Law Guardians in Bonnie Scotland are still legally prevented from relieving the able-bodied poor, though proposals to change the law in this respect have been mooted since 1866. A Bill to abolish the prohibition, without making much provision for the relief, passed its Second Reading on October 27th.

So progress bounds ahead in this progressive land! T.A.(t)

What Poplar Won.

On October 28th the Local Authorities (Financial Provisions) Bill passed the Second Reading. Its purpose is to equalise the London poor rate, set up a small committee to lay down a general scale of relief and provide inspectors "to see that so far as is humanly possible," as Sir A. Mond put it, "there is no undue extragavance by any Board of Guardians."

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

The Unemployment Deportation Swindle.

The New Zealand *Transport Worker* says:—

"The present political heads of the country, evidently for political purposes, allege that there are no unemployed in New Zealand worth talking about, and that there is plenty of room, employment, and houses for the worker immigrants the Government is responsible for bringing to the country at this juncture. What the real motive is one can only conjecture, but the opinion is general that the Government in this matter are acting as agents for the employers in an effort to reduce wages and general working conditions of New Zealand workers."

As New Zealand workers well know, there is both unemployment and overcrowding on the island; deputations of unemployed are waiting upon the Government, and conferences of workers and workless are being convened to deal with the pressing question of unemployment.

The *Transport Worker* goes on to state that in New Zealand there are few housemaids and waitresses who get less than £2 a week with board and lodgings. This difference in the purchasing power of the pound in New Zealand must be taken into account in judging wages rates. Nevertheless, says the *Transport Worker*, a paragraph appeared in the Wellington *Evening Post* stating that a mother and daughter had arrived in New Zealand with only 20s. between them, but the mother had secured employment as a hand laundress at £2 a week with board and lodging. This was recorded as a stroke of luck; but, says the *Transport Worker*, the billet of head laundress at £2 a week "had gone begging till the widow immigrant came on the scene stoney broke. . . . The occupation of a laundress is one not governed by an award of the Industrial Court."

The *Transport Worker* further complains of unemployed being engaged at the public works at Kaidale on railway and road construction at wages ranging from 8s. to 10s. a day, "which rate is considerably below the standard wage arranged and agreed to for such employment."

Fourth International Conference.

At the Communist Workers' Party Conference in Berlin greetings were received from a part of the South Slavonic Communist Party, which had formed an opposition group called the "Revolutionary Organisation of the Communists."

They stated they had hoped to link up with all parties and groups of the Left, and with the S.L.P., to form a united nucleus of opposition within the III. International, and so give it the necessary revolutionary tendency. The III. International, however, not only gave them no chance of doing so, but further declared itself for the opportunist policy of their leaders, and thus showed its own opportunist character.

To the same effect spoke the Bulgarian Left-Wing Communist Prodanoff. He said further: "At the third Congress we understood that we could not revolutionise this International, which is showing itself ever more and more opportunist. We saw that we wanted large masses, even if uncommunistic, but did have none of the "Left" elements which are genuinely revolutionary. The Moscow Executive told us clearly that we Communists of the Left Wing, who wished to carry out the revolutionary tactics, to hasten the world-revolution, might no longer remain in the ranks of their International, and that we were preparing places for us in the prisons."

The Swedish Young-Socialist Party wrote: "We, for ourselves, stand in opposition to the III. International. Good luck to the fight against the tyranny of party-rule."

South African Widow loses her Pension.

A South African soldier's widow receiving a pension of 1s. a day for herself and 1s. 2d. a day each for her children was expecting another baby, and financial difficulties. She altered her pensions order from £6 5s. 4d. to £16 5s. 4d., and succeeded in drawing the larger sum. She was sentenced to 70 days' hard labour and the total loss of her pension. In vain she pleaded:—

"I am expecting to become a mother, and I am very sorry for what occurred. I was in very great difficulties at the time, and I am quite willing for you to receive my pension until I have paid back the money, if you would only let me have it. It would be a support for my little children at such time as I am able to find something to do. . . . I hope you will consider my case and be very lenient for my dear children's sake."

Under Communism such cases can never occur.

Fourth International in Holland.

A split has occurred amongst the Dutch Communists, the Communist Workers' Party, led by Herman Gorter and Anton Pannekoek, has been formed. It adheres to the Fourth International. The new Dutch C.W.P. publishes a weekly organ, *De Kommunist*, the first number of which has just reached us. The organ of the Dutch Communist Party, of which Wynkoek is the leader, is *De Tribune*.

FROM THE GERMAN COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY.

(Our own Special Correspondent .....)

The parliamentary-political parties here in Germany are mightily excited about the "unheard of" decision of the Entente Powers through their useful tool the League of Nations—in the question of Upper Silesia, and their executive bodies are seriously deliberating as to the possibility of escape from this "awful" political and economic dilemma. The only Party showing no appreciation of the "disgust" over the "vast injury" inflicted on "poor" down-trodden Germany is the Communist Workers' Party which, as we have already pointed out in these notes, pursues steadily and consistently the path of truly revolutionary Communism, and therefore takes up a corresponding attitude on all questions.

The Expected Coalition.

The bourgeois parties of the Left, Centre and Democrats, would, of course, like to fight against the enforcement of the Entente's decision, but strong still is their desire and need for sticking to office and saving the "dear fatherland" from despoilment and ruin by either the "Left or Right Extremists." The joyful expectation of an early coalition of the German People's Party (Stinnes Party) with the Social Democrats is at the moment somewhat damped by the attitude of the Stinnes Party in the question of Upper Silesia—an attitude it shares with the German-National Party, namely, to offer the most determined opposition to the Entente concert in their endeavour to still further "humble" poor Germany materially and morally.

Left Socialists Council submission to Entente.

The Left Socialists (Independents) impress upon the workers the need of the immediate acceptance of the decision, seeing that Germany is compelled to bow to the inevitable on patriotic grounds. The Right Socialists (Ebert-Noske Party) adopt a very similar attitude, and point out at the same time the need of the Wirth Cabinet remaining in office. The Communist Party (the Section of the Third International) again denounces with hot indignation the "game" of dependent and independent Socialists, whom these opportunist Communists accuse of recommending to the working class to bear patiently these fresh blows of Entente Imperialism, so that the German bourgeoisie may gain breathing space. One need hardly claim the power of prophecy to be able to foretell that in spite of all the "fuming" on the part of the German-National and Stinnes Parties the Entente decision as to the boundaries of Upper Silesia and the control of its mineral treasures will be accepted by the German Government without flinching, and that eventually the Stinnes Party will join the Democratic bloc of the Government together with the Social Democrats. The trade unions in Upper Silesia have publicly demonstrated for national resistance of the Entente decision. To these unions belong all shades of Socialists, including the Communists of the Third International.

Socialists lose Municipal Majority.

The communal elections last Sunday were of a very tame character. The bourgeois parties, as well as the three Socialist Parties, had for several weeks previously indulged in a "heavy tongue-campaign" to rally the workers to their respective camps, but the "red house," as the town hall owing to its having been controlled by a Socialist majority was called, is no more, the bourgeois parties having obtained 114 seats out of a total of 225.

The parliamentary Communists and Socialists are, of course, most indignant at this "disgusting result," and indulge in vehement abuse of the workers, "who have again given their masters the majority." But, in fact, a large percentage, quite 30 per cent., have abstained from recording their votes as a result of all the three Socialist Parties having demonstrated in a "united front" in order to mourn the loss of poor Erzberger (the one-time-renown Chancellor of Germany), and owing to all these working-class parties joining hands with the "bourgeois parties of the middle" in order to protect and safeguard the black-red-gold Republic against ill designs of the extreme right party—the Autocratic Monarchists.

Eight Hour Day to be scrapped.

In economic respects the situation is quite as troublesome as it has been since the "glorious revolution" in November, 1918. The breaking through the legal eight-hour working-day is proceeding apace. Now, the State railway authorities are endeavouring to emulate the private employers of labour. At Halle a vote has recently been taken among the railway workers on the question of abandoning the eight-hour day. Over 90 per cent. voted for a strike against the intended encroachment. The prominent leaders of the railway workers are already prepaing them for the need of submitting to the inevitable by arguing that they must preserve their strength for coming fights for wages, also that there are no reasons nor the necessary courage for entering into a strike on that score.

Strikes.

The general lock-out of the printers has just come to an end. The Minister of Labour has succeeded in bringing the two parties together. The dispute began in the Mosse concern about some paltry deduction of wages. As all the employees stood firmly together against interference with their tariff they were all locked out. Thereupon followed a strike in sympathy by all those engaged in the production of the bourgeois press. The employers in the printing trade had just resolved to lock out all workers employed in the trade when a settlement was reached.

The strike of the hotel and restaurant employees still continues, and leads at times to violent scenes between strikers and strike breakers. A good number of employers have conceded the strikers' demand (wages of 400 marks per week), others have closed their establishments, some employ strike-breakers and others manage by getting the customers to serve themselves.

It has been most difficult for the K.A.P.D. (Communist Workers' Party) to gather again the actual forces of revolution in face of the stagnation that had set in after the March rising, and the Party's secession from the Third International. But the struggle of the Moscow followers here to establish an "all-Socialist fighting front" is hopless, and their great anxiety to protect the black-red-gold Democratic Republic, *together* with all other *loyal Republican Parties* (as Clara Zetkin recently expressed it in the Reichstag). This policy and tactics is rapidly bearing fruit, and can only tend considerably to strengthen the revolutionary movement.

Are You
Doing Your Bit
for the
WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT
FUND?
It is not
back to a penny yet.
But it could be.
with your help.
Meanwhile, help to carry on.

B.S.I.S.L.P.

The British Section International Socialist Labour Party of Edinburgh has just sent us its election manifesto for our criticism.

In our opinion Socialists should take no part in elections to Parliament or the local governing bodies. The manifesto calls upon the electors to "vote for Socialism." They cannot vote for Socialism through the Borough Council. At the present time the local councils and boards are faced with the unemployed problem; they have no power to solve it; small power to ameliorate it. By attempting to administer the machinery they have been elected to control they are making themselves responsible for the system, for the paltry doles meted out to the workless, and for the refusal of such doles. The business of Socialists, in our view, is to lead the workers against all the machinery of Government under capitalism, not to take part in administering it. We will put the matter in an extreme form by asking a question: Would the B.S.I.S.L.P. send one of its members to take charge of the police, the army or the navy for Lloyd George's Government, and thus assist in maintaining the order and security of the capitalist State?

To sit on a Borough Council, in our opinion, is the same, in principle, as to accept a seat in a capitalist Coalition Government; the Borough Councils administer the laws of the Government.

LIBERAL ORGANS AGAINST IRISH REPUBLIC.

These passages from leading articles on the vote of censure debate in the two leading Liberal newspapers mean that the Government can count on Liberal support for war with Ireland should the Conference break down:—

"There are certain things which no statesman in this country can surrender, and Mr. Lloyd George does not propose to surrender them."—*Manchester Guardian.*

"Mr. Lloyd George himself issued a grave and terrible warning as to the consequences of failure. While we deplore the alternative which he thought fit to suggest to the House, and should oppose it with all our might, we desire to emphasise its significance in order to make clear to the Irish leaders that if this conference breaks down through any stubborn pursuit of shadows on their part or any lack of true statesmanship it will mean the utter failure of all their hopes and the hopes of all the sincerest friends of Irish freedom."—*Daily News.*

:: CORRESPONDENCE. ::

Dear Editor,—It was with great pleasure I read the inspiring article in the *Workers' Dreadnought* on "New Tactics." The failure of the III. International and the large Communist Parties has become obvious within recent months. The birth of the IV. International is the first step in cleaning up the Communist movement.

Opportunism and reaction must have no place in the world movement of the revolutionary vanguard. I am therefore forwarding my name as an adherent of the IV. Communist Workers' International. I have worked in the Workers' International Industrial Union inside the Trade Union and at the street corner. This organisation is opposed to the Red Trade Union International, because it is opposed to the violent overthrow of the capitalist class, and desires a peaceful solution. My intention is to withdraw from this organisation and start propaganda on behalf of the Communist Workers' Party.

LABOUR OUT OR IN.

The Labour Party walked out of the House the other night, as a protest against the Government's cowardly treatment of the unemployed. This is the first time in its history that the Labour Party has departed in the least degree from the most strict and punctillious respect for the procedure of the bosses' House of Pretence.

It is a curious coincidence that in our issue of last week, we stated that if the Labour Party were well led, it would walk out of the Chamber, but we did not say that the Party, if well led would appear tamely on its benches the following day. No, indeed; we said that if it were well led; if it really had the will to become the Government of the country, it would walk out and not return until a General Election had taken place. We said that at all costs it would divest itself of any shadow of responsibility for the neglect of the unemployed and the coming Irish war.

Mr. Henderson and his colleagues do not want an early General Election; because they do not feel sure that it would bring them into power, and it would cost money; moreover, it seems to them that things are in such a mess with the country, that they think they would rather not be the Government just now. Trade is so bad: they are afraid it might be said they had hindered the recovery of trade if they were in control. They know, also, that neither the unemployed, nor the Irish will be satisfied with the Labour Party proposals for them, because, as a matter of fact, the Labour Party proposals differ very little from those of Lloyd George.

A General Election might not give a majority to the Labour Party; but it would quicken the pace, and so bring nearer the day when the Labour Party will come into power. But the Labour Party is timid: it does not want to find itself on the Treasury bench in all this chaos; it does not know what it would do if King George were to summon it to form a Government.

Of course, as King George's Government, it could do nothing for the workers: it would be more helpless than Lloyd George; for he gets the help of the capitalists, and the Labour Party could only get the same assistance on terms so stiff that the Labour lieutenants, to say nothing of the rank and file, would soon become restive.

If the Labour Party were really a party working class emancipation, it would walk out of the House of Commons, not to force an early election, but to set up the Soviets and repudiate the power of Westminster. It is large enough to do that if it desired, but it does not. The Labour Party will never do any such thing: Lloyd George and King George may have perfect confidence in Mr. Henderson and his Party. Did not Mr. Henderson express his fealty to the capitalist Empire Constitution in the debate on the Unionist Vote of Censure? Did he not insist that there must be "security for Great Britain"? Has not Mr. Lloyd George defined that as meaning that Ireland must remain within the British Empire?

Indeed, the established Order has nothing to fear from Mr. Henderson and his Party: nothing whatever.

Nevertheless, we want to see a Labour Government in office, not because we are under any illusions that our Right Wing Communist friends will capture the Labour Party: on the contrary, we know that if they are received into the Labour Party, they will either be swallowed up there, or come out of it sadder and wiser people. We are under no illusions about that *bloc* with the Labour Party, Comrade Paul; either it will not come off, or you will have to surrender every ounce of your Communism.

We want to see a Labour Government because we want the workers to realise that it will do nothing for them; because, so long as the capitalists control production and hold the wealth of the country, every Government, whatever may be its name must obey the dictates of the capitalists.

Whilst we shall be pleased to see a Labour Government in office, we know that it will get there without our assistance in due time, and since the task of preparing the workers for the Soviets is not the spare-time play of a child, but the most gigantic effort that humanity has ever faced, we refuse to be deflected from that effort by the fugitive object of getting a Labour Government into office.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT BOOK SERVICE.

152, FLEET STREET
(Entrance first door on left in Bolt Court from Fleet Street.)

Open Daily, 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

We can supply you with any book you desire, new or second-hand, from British, Colonial, or foreign publishers. Give us all particulars you have, and send a deposit.

By buying books from us, trade discount is transferred to propaganda.

At our office you may consult publishers' catalogues and place your order for any book not in stock.

If you order by post, you must add, on the average, one penny for every shilling, to cover postage.

We charge the postage of foreign books, from London only, and fix price at current rate of exchange.

WE CAN SUPPLY!

Books on History and Economics.

Creative Revolution (*E. & C. Paul*) 8/6
Whitherward? Hell or Eutopia (*Victor Branford* 2/6
George Borrow and his Circle (*Clement King Shorter*) 7/6
Africa and the Peace of Europe (*E. D. Morell*) 2/-
The Fruits of Victory (*Norman Angell*) 3/6
The Intellectual and the Worker (*Philip Kurinsky*) ..... 6d.
Industrial Unionism and Revolution (*Philip Kurinsky*) ..... 6d.
Modern Science (*Leo Tolstoy*) ..... 2d.
An Appeal to the Young (*P. Kropotkin*) ... 2d.
Gold, Prices and the Witwatersrand (*R. A. Lehfeldt*) 5/-
Origin of Poverty, and Formation of the Village Community (*J. St. Lewinski, D.Ec.Sc., Brussels*) 3/6
The Miners' Conflict with the Mineowners (*John Thomas, B.A.*) ..... 8d.
The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain during the Nineteenth Century. (*L. C.A. Knowles, Litt.D.*). 432 pages. Cr. 8vo. 6/6
The Industrial History of Modern England. (*G. H. Perris*). 603 pages. 8/6
The Inequality of Incomes in Modern Communities (*Hugh Dalton, M.A.*). 8vo. ... 10/6
Capital, Vols. I., II., III. (*Karl Marx*) each 7/6
The Working Life of English Women in the Seventeenth Century. 8v. 10/6
Civil War in France (*Karl Marx*) 3/-
A.B.C. of Communism (*Bukharin*) 2/9
Communism (*Eden and Cedar Paul*) ..... 6d.
A History of Trades Councils, 1860-1875 (*Cicely Richards*) 1/-
With the Turk in War Time (*Marmaduke Pickthall*) 5/-
Red Europe (*Frank Anstey*) 3/3
Economic Consequences of the Peace (*Keynes*) 2/-
Social Theory (*G. D. H. Cole*) 4/6

A large Stock of Russian Literature.

Russia Before and After the Revolution (*S. Carlyle Potter*) 1/-
Before and After the Revolution (*S. Carlyle Potter*) 1/-
The Defence of Terrorism: A Reply to Karl Kautsky (*L. Trotsky*) 3/6
Soviet Russia as I Saw it (*Sylvia Pankhurst*) 2/6

Novels, Poetry, etc., with a Communist Tendency

Songs of Labour (*Rosenfeld*) 3/-
Samuel Butler's Works ..... each 7/6
Erehwon; Erehwon Re-visited.
The Way of all Flesh: a Novel.
The Note Books of Samuel Butler.
Justice and Liberty (*G. Lowes Dickinson*). 3/-
Factory Echoes (*R. M. Fox*) 1/-
The Red Dawn (*Albert Young*) ..... 6d.
The Fool Next Door (*N. D. Douglas*) 2/-
The Good Hope: A Play in 5 Acts, by *Herman Heigermans*. English version by *Christopher St. John* 2/6
The East I Knew (*Claudel*) 3/-
Jack London's Novels, 2/- each.

The Night Born.	Mutiny of the Elsinore.
The Jacket.	The Red One.
The Road.	Michael, Brother of Jerry
The Human Drift.	When God Laughs.
The House of Pride.	Moon Face.
The Valley of the Moon.	The Strength of the Strong
The War of the Classes.	The Iron Heel.
John Barleycorn.	The Scarlet Plague.
White Fang.	Revolution.
Love and Life.	Etc.

Looking Beyond. A Sequel to "Looking Backward" (*L. A. Geissler*) ..... paper 1/6, cloth 3/-
Looking Backward (*Edward Bellamy*) paper 2/-, limp cloth 3/-, stiff boards 3/6
A Sequel to Looking Backward (*Richard Michaelis*) ..... paper 1/6
The Spy (*Upton Sinclair*) 3/6
Prison Impressions (*Clare Gilbert Cole*) ..... 6d.
Works by Anatole France (*Translated into English*) 2/-
The Crime of Sylvestre Bonnard 2/-
The Red Lily 2/-
Penguin Island 2/-
Thais 2/-
Monsieur Bergeret in Paris 7/6
Clio and the Chateau de Vaux-le-Vicomte... 7/6
On Life and Letters (*3rd Series*) 7/6
" " (*4th Series*) 7/6
Le Comte Morin Deputé (*Illustrated by Henri Basthelemy*) 7/6
Marguérite (*Illustrated by Siméon*) 7/6

Communist Books, Literature and Periodicals in German, French, Russian, Norwegian, Dutch, etc.

Reduced Rates are offered to customers taking over a hundred copies of the following pamphlets

Name or Title	Price Each.	Price Doz.	Price per 100.
Red Russia (*Reed*)	6d.	4/-	16/-
Ireland (*Gorter*)	1d.	9d.	4/-
The Finnish Revolution	3d.	2/6	8/-
The Communist Party and Industrial Unionism (*Zinoviev*)	2d.	1/6	8/-
The Hungarian Revolution (*Schmidt*)	9d.	8/9	24/-
Bourgeois Democracy (*Lenin*)	2d.	1/6	8/-
The Truth About Russia (*Ransome*)	4d.	3/-	12/
Facts About Communist Hungary (*Alice Riggs Hunt*)	4d.	3/-	16/-
To British Workers (with map explaining Soviets' working system	½d.	2d.	1/-

COMRADE NORAH SMYTH will speak on her experiences in Russia. Organisations should apply by letter to 400, Old Ford Road, London, E. 3.

THE EDITOR is "at home" in the *Dreadnought* Office, 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4, the last Sunday in the month from 4 to 6 p.m.

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

The Preliminary Committee of the Workers' Communist Party is prepared to enrol members. Apply by letter only to *Workers' Dreadnought*, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

JUST OUT. NEW EDITION.

COMMUNISM AND THE FAMILY

KOLLONTAY'S SPLENDID PAMPHLET.

Price - 4d.

Tells what everyone wants to know about life under Communism.

Strikes a blow at Capitalist Social Conventions.

From *WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT* Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DENTISTRY.

For Satisfactory Teeth see
F. ALDRIDGE, Communist, **44 Waterloo Road, S.E.1.**
10 per cent. Discount for Comrades.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

EXPERIENCED Housekeeper desires situation. Good references. Apply Box 10, *Workers' Dreadnought*, Fleet Street.

HELPERS WANTED.—Comrades with time to spare for clerical and other voluntary work in the *Dreadnought* Office, and for paper selling and other work outside, are requested to write to the Manager, *Workers' Dreadnought* Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C.

Published by E. Sylvia Pankhurst at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4, and printed by S. Corio at 10, Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.