

Workers' Breadnought

VOL. VII.—No 4.

SATURDAY, APRIL 17th, 1920.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE BASIS OF COMMUNISM.

By HERMAN CORTER.

I. CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

The world-war and the revolution that resulted from it, have clearly demonstrated that only one trend in the labour movement leads the workers to Communism.

The right track has been found only by the extreme left wing of the Social-Democratic Parties, the Marxians.

The principles of these latter are given here.

The first duty of the revolutionary worker is that of learning to understand capitalist society. Until he does that, he can not be truly revolutionary.

The Communist Party, in order to render the entire working class revolutionary in feeling, in thought, in will, and in deed, strives to give the clearest possible image of capitalist society as a whole.

Capital constitutes the nature, the marrow of our community. We cannot understand anything about our community if we do not understand capital.

What is capital, where does capital come from, how does it come to exist?

Capital is the accumulated sum total of wares or values, that is to say, of the raw materials, products, implements, etc., in the hands of the owning classes—which sum-total has the faculty of constantly increasing, of accumulating in the hands of those owning classes.

How does capital originate? What causes its constant increase?

It comes from the workers. Its accumulation is a result of labour.

Every day an exchange takes place between the worker and the capitalist. The worker gives his working-capacity to the capitalist, for the day, to make use of; the capitalist gives the worker a day's wage. From that exchange capital results.

For that exchange is unequal. What the worker produces in a day exceeds by far the wage he gets. If the worker works from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., at noontime he may already have produced a value equalling his wage. The rest of his labour he gives to the capitalist, without remuneration. There is a surplus, therefore, on the side of the capitalist. There is, there arises, there comes capital out of the willing hands of the worker into the hands of the capitalist. Capital is unpaid labour.

Though every worker feels this to be true, we will point out yet more clearly.

This matter, which may not be absolutely clear in the case of one worker, working one day, is rendered perfectly obvious if we take the entire working class of an entire country or of a continent, or of the world, during a full year.

Let us assume that the rectangular figure below represents production of the workers of an entire country, or of the world, for the capitalist class.

A
B
C

For a while the workers have these products in their hands. In the factory and the mine, on the railway and the ship, and in the field they produce them with their hands, and with the tools of their hands.

This possession lasts only a moment. As soon as the product is finished and shipped, they must deliver it up to the owners of the means

of production, the capitalists. It is on account of the private ownership of the means of production that the workers cannot retain the product for a second beyond the time they spend in making it. After that, the capitalists are the absolute masters of the product.

How do the capitalists dispose of it?

Money is the means of exchange that renders possible the circulation of wares in capitalist society. Money, like coal or wheat, is a labour-product (gold, silver, copper, etc.) used for the special purpose of facilitating the exchange. Here, again, of all the gold and silver the workers produce, no more than a small portion



THE SEAL OF HONOUR.

"We already have our Percentage."

They divide it, largely speaking, into three parts.

To indicate these, we draw two lines in such a way as to get the pieces A B C.

Piece A, the capitalist class, gives back to the workers; of all the fuel, food, clothing, housing and furniture the working class brings forth for the benefit of all, for the capitalists, as well as for themselves, only this small portion comes back to them. They get but little of all the coal they produce, of all the iron, and a miserable share of all the wheat. This is part A, representing the working-wage. For, needless to point out, the workers do not get their wage in coal or food directly, but in the shape of money, for which they can buy food or coal.

comes back to them, which is likewise included, therefore, in piece A.

From piece B, the capitalist class lives. That portion of the products which the workers produce for it in a year represents furniture, housing, food, clothing, fuel, and luxury. Needless to say, the capitalists live off this portion on a larger and ampler scale than the proletarians do off the portion which is left to them. Piece B is doubtless immense, and, as compared to the number of people that must have a share in it, it far surpasses piece A of the proletarians. For not only the capitalists, the employers of the working hands, must live off piece C, but their entire gang of followers also. The bankers, merchants, shipowners, landowners, the railway

magnates, the manufacturers, all those, in short, live off that piece who employ workers of any kind, whether those workers be clerks or dockers, sailors or miners, and with them the many whom the employers needs in order to maintain capitalist society.

Off the bits of piece B, as thrown to them by the capitalists, live the princes, the judges, the officers, the ministers, the professors. The entire army, the fleet, the bureaucracy, the church, etc., etc.

The State, therefore, lives to a large extent off piece B, and partly also off a considerable portion of piece A, which is wrung from the workers. It is a well-known fact that the capitalist class does not content itself with giving the workers a small wage, but that it even robs them of part of that wage by means of the taxes, which, in the capitalist countries, are heavily imposed on the labouring classes, especially as indirect taxes.

And the third piece, C; what does the capitalist class do with it?

The capitalists are too wise to use up their entire produce. Just as the landowners and the farmers every year do not sell all their wheat for consumption, but retain part of it as seed for the coming year, the capitalist reserves a portion which he does not consume, but which serves to enlarge his business, his mill, the next year. The reserves accumulated by all the enterprises of capitalism make C a huge piece, and it increases every year. That lump of capital, which had issued from the hands of the workers, represents the new railways, the new steamers, the new machines, the new mines, the newly cultivated land, the new houses, and so on. Only a small portion of the total amount is consumed by workers and capitalists. Another, even greater portion, remains to serve in the following year for a new, increased production, on a higher scale.

This is a clear and true image of our society. The class of the wage-earners bringing forth out of the earth the entire wealth. The capitalist class appropriating that produce, living on it, on a grand scale, multiplying its capital to an extent that we will yet examine further on, and in exchange for years of toil, giving to the working class only a small share in its enormous produce.

In exchange, did we say?

Is it an exchange? Can we call it an exchange?

Closely considered, it proves to be not even that.

That which the working class receives is part of what it actually produces, and for what the workers receive they must give even more in labour. The weekly wage the workers receive, the fuel, the food, and so on, which they get for the week, have just been given by them to the capitalists, and the workers get the wage back on Saturday night, only that they may be able to go back to work the next week, again to produce for the capitalist class more than they will get on the following Saturday.

If I give to some person a shilling, and from my own shilling he gives me back sixpence, this cannot be called an exchange, especially if that sixpence must serve only to enable me to earn another shilling, or even more, next day, to be given also to the same person who took the first shilling from me.

This is the basis of society as it is to-day, this so-called exchange; it is a basis so glaringly unjust, so outrageous, that no God or heaven can justify it.

Each day all the workers give to their capitalists more than they receive, each day all the capitalists take away from their workers more than they return to them. Every year the capitalists retain a large share of this profit made out of the workers, which portion they add to their old capital. Having thus obtained ever more capital, ever more raw material and means of production, they force the non-propertied workers, under ever increasing compulsion, to sell themselves to capital, to do whatever capital requires of them.

That all this should be allowed to go on as it does is due to private property, which came into existence centuries ago, and to this day is still extant. We can abstain from demonstrating how it came to be developed out of the common property, or what changes it underwent. This

has been done with full clearness elsewhere. We need only mention it here. The main fact is evident for whosoever chooses to reflect. The capitalists could never compel the workers to the sham exchange, the workers would never submit to it, if the capitalists did not own the soil and the means of production, and if the workers were not devoid of all possessions. The man who owns no land or capital, must eat nevertheless; he needs clothes, and a roof over his head. He wants a wife and children. He owns nothing but his labour-power. So he sells that, his only possession. And the capitalist, taking advantage of the fact that the worker can produce in a day more than he actually needs, lets him work for twelve hours, and appropriates all the produce that is not needed to keep the worker alive. It may, therefore, be taken for granted that the cause of this inequality, this injustice, this poverty on the one hand, and opulence on the other, lies in the private ownership of the means of production. All this can only disappear if the cause be abolished likewise.

We must point out here that the inequality is steadily increasing, that the class antitheses are intensified each day.

At the time, as yet, when the implements were imperfectly developed, the worker was not able to produce much more than was needed to keep himself and his family alive. Considerably less clothing, food and fuel is produced with the manual tools than with the machine, the electric loom, the steam-plough, the sewing-machine and the electric drill. In the days of manual labour, therefore, the surplus for the capitalist was far smaller than it is to-day. Consequently, also, the inequality between the capitalist and the worker was smaller.

As the power of the machines increased, however, the worker's daily output began more and more to exceed his own needs. The value of the day's produce has come ever more to surpass the value of the daily wage. Ever more wealth has accumulated in the hands of the capitalists. In the 14th, 15th, and even 16th century, the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist was still such that the latter often lived in hardly better circumstances than his working-hands, whilst in most cases he was himself obliged to work just as hard as they. In the 16th century, and still more in the 17th century, the power of the means of production increased; the workshops were gradually fitted out with better tools, and more workers were added. A division of labour led to a saving of time and produce. In England in the 18th century, a mill-owner was for the first time seen driving his own private carriage, a luxury which, up to that time, had been exclusively enjoyed by the land-owners, the gentry, the princes and the clergy. The 19th century, with its steam and electricity, witnessed a decrease in the hours needed by the worker to provide for his own needs, whereas the time during which he worked without payment increased at the same terrific rate as did the power of the tools.

The capital-power of our modern capitalists is enormous. The amount of unpaid labour they appropriate can be judged to some extent from the increase of the so-called national wealth in every capitalist country.

The income tax records testify to the same. The well-known American financier Vanderlip says, that the capital invested in industrial enterprises (limited companies) in the United States, in the course of six years, before the war, increased by 23 thousand millions.

The inequality, therefore, is continually growing. New inventions and improvements in machinery are constantly being introduced. Less and less time is needed for the production of the worker's clothes, the worker's food, the worker's furniture, and the worker's fuel. Part A of our figure, therefore, is produced in an ever smaller period of time, whilst ever more time remains for the production of B and C. No wonder that the so-called national wealth increases! No wonder that the millionaires of old have become milliardaires. At the same rate, however, the antithesis between proletarian destitution and capitalistic wealth increases.

Thus the existence of the class struggle can be seen and grasped at once, from our diagram.

(To be continued.)

CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND REVOLUTION.

The Co-operative movement is a creation of petty bourgeois ideology. It is an attempt by sections of the working-class to mitigate some of the evils of Capitalism as they affect themselves, by entering into the fields of capitalist manufacture and trading on their own account.

Co-operative trading is capitalist trading, though a large number of small shareholders are involved, and both share capital and dividends are limited.

Co-operative trading, like all capitalist trading, has a corrupting tendency, and creates in the workers engaged in it a bourgeois psychology and the employers' spirit. Hence, it is not uncommon even to find cases of gross sweating by co-operative societies, and the general conditions of co-operative employees differ little from those of employees in similar private firms. As Co-operative trading is carried on within the capitalist system, and Co-operatives are compelled by their customers to sell at the market rate, they could not remain solvent if they were to raise the conditions of their employees much above the general capitalist standard. As a matter of fact, when profits beyond the assigned limit for dividend are made, they are usually devoted, not to increasing wages, but to reducing prices, or extending the scope of the enterprise.

The corrupting influence of co-operative Capitalism is shown by the fact that co-operative employees have found it necessary to band themselves together in a special organisation of their own, because the ordinary trade unions are reluctant to press co-operative committees to grant trade union conditions to their employees. The lock-out of members of the Amalgamated Union of Co-operative Employees by the Co-operatives last year is a striking instance of the kinship between capitalist and Co-operative trading. Co-operative societies of producers, in which all the employees are partners in the enterprise and take an equal share of its profits, avoid many of the objectionable characteristics of Capitalism, which are inevitably acquired when the enterprise is owned by consumers and shareholders who do not work in it, but are the employers of the producers. Nevertheless, even the producers' co-operatives cannot avoid being modified by their capitalist environment, and must inevitably conform very largely to its conditions. Moreover, Co-operative trading by producers has a tendency to separate these producers from the mass of the proletariat, and to obscure their realisation of the class struggle.

As the basis of co-operative trading and manufacture is capitalist, the co-operative societies tend to oppose the proletarian revolution. In Russia, the Co-operative Societies took up an attitude of bitter opposition to the Soviet power, and allowed themselves to be used for counter-revolutionary ends by all sections of the bourgeoisie. When the Co-operative Bank was the only non-Soviet bank remaining, it allowed itself to become a bulwark of counter-revolutionary forces. The Soviet Government has striven to bring about the absorption of the co-operatives into the general machinery of the Co-operative State, and to strip them of their power for evil.

The Allied Governments recognised the counter-revolutionary tendency of the co-operatives when they offered to allow trading through them, and not through the Soviet Government. The representative of the Russian co-operatives in London are hostile to the Soviets. The intention of the Allies was to re-establish private trading in Russia, and to bolster up the power of the co-operatives in opposition to the Soviets.

British co-operatives possess extensive productive and distributive machinery. If

a clash should arise between Capitalism and a reformist Labour Government, the co-operatives would probably use their machinery in support of the Labour Government. But the Co-operatives would either act against, or, at the least, hold aloof from a Proletarian Revolution, until that Revolution had certainly conquered the power of State, when the Co-operatives might possibly offer their services to the revolutionary power in order to stave off their own extinction.

In a Communist society, the co-operatives, as they now exist, could have no more than a temporary place; all their shareholding dividend and private trading apparatus must be swept away. The productive and distributive industries in which the co-operatives are concerned, must be carried on on the same lines as other Socialised industries. The workers in the industries now under the co-operatives must have, under Communism, the same workers' control that applies to workers in other industries.

When the revolution comes, it is quite probable that the industries which have been seized from Capitalism, and are being carried on under a Soviet system of Workers' Control, will prove much more trustworthy and efficient than the Co-operatives.

In the meantime, the Communist Party should set to work to form Communist groups amongst the employees of the Co-operative societies, and should strive to stimulate the class consciousness of these workers and to awake in them the desire for Communism and Workers' Control.

E.S.P.

ITALY.

Workers take possession of Factories in Naples

A demand of the operatives in the factories of Miano and Silvestro for a hundred per cent. increase in wages having been met by proposals of delay, the workers took possession of the factories, hoisted the red flags, expelled the managers and engineers, and continued work. The factories were immediately surrounded by loyal guards, but the workers fortified the entrances, and met all attempts to expel them by showers of stones and other missiles. Towards the evening the besiegers brought up machine-guns and 75's, and bombarded the factories for fifteen minutes, after which the workers hoisted the white flag, and were expelled. Four men were severely wounded.

General Strike Declared.

In protest against this serious conduct on the part of the military, a general twenty-four hours' strike was declared in Naples, and responded to almost with unanimity.

A similar general strike took place three weeks ago in Naples, when two pickets in the strike of restaurant workers were wounded by the royal guard, and a more dramatic general strike at Milan at the beginning of March, when the guards fired on a demonstration in support of war victims.

Milan Demonstrates Against Hungarian Terror.

A tremendous crowd of more than 100,000 people marched in procession last week with music and banners to the public square of Milan to demonstrate against the White Terror in Hungary.

Agricultural Strikes.

A strike of agricultural workers was declared last week in the district of Brescia, and 30,000 farm hands have ceased work.

Strikes of agricultural workers are also in progress in the districts of Novara, Parma, Ferrara, and Alexandria.

IRISH SOLIDARITY.

The national strike of Irish workers announced by the Irish Trade Union Congress to force the release of Irish hunger-strikers is one of those exhibitions of solidarity which compel admiration. Nevertheless, we wish that the Irish industrial organisations were able to do as much in the class struggle.

PENSION THE KING.

On the King's Balmoral, Birkhall, and Abergeldie estates £3 a week has been refused to the gardeners and labourers. Why does not one of the Labour Members of Parliament introduce a Bill to superannuate the King at the usual old-age pension's rate? In that case he would think the pension very small if it were raised to £3 a week.

THE FIRST OF MAY.

French Socialists are preparing for a 24-hours strike on the first of May.

The Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of the Third International has issued a call for a demonstration strike in support of Soviet Russia on the first of May. Bring this up in your branch. We will supply copies of the Amsterdam manifesto in return for a halfpenny stamp.

TOWARDS THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

TRADE UNIONS AND REVOLUTION.

Sailors' and Firemen's Union—continued.

The South Wales Miners' Federation has made the abolition of Capitalism one of its registered objects, thus: rule 3:—

(b) To secure the entire organisation of all workers employed in and about the collieries situate in South Wales and Monmouthshire Coalfield, with a view to the complete abolition of Capitalism, and that membership of the Federation shall be a condition of employment.

We have already referred to object 19, which aims at providing "an efficient class of men for the Mercantile Marine, and to see that all members of the Union are on board their ships at the time appointed, in a fit and proper condition, ready for work, and to provide funds for this purpose at the discretion of the Executive Council.

A resolution to delete object 19 should be moved at the first opportunity.

The Executive should be called on to report as to what funds it has spent in doing the employer's work in conformity with this rule.

The Sailors' and Firemen's Union might substitute a clause like the miners for object 19, or it might adopt a clause on the following lines:—

To secure the complete abolition of Capitalism and the substitution of Communism.

To secure for the seafaring workers control of their industry as one of the departments of an Industrial Republic with a Soviet structure.

To make membership of the Union a condition of employment.

Strike Pay and the Executive.

Rule vii. governs the conditions on which strike pay is paid. Section 2 of this rule states:—

In any movement against a reduction of wages or an increase of hours not justified by events, or in any movement for obtaining a justifiable increase of wages, or a reduction of hours, the Union shall assist the members concerned in the conduct of such movements through the Executive Council.

It shall then be the duty of the Executive Council to state the circumstances of the dispute to the branches of the Union, and the Executive Council may take a vote of all the members at home able and willing to vote on the appeal of those members affected by the dispute. The voting shall be by ballot and shall be open for four successive days at the respective branch meeting places. The votes shall be returned to the Executive Council, submitted to a scrutiny, and counted. A majority of votes shall decide for or against the appeal and determine whether or not assistance shall be given to enable members to withhold their labour.

In the first place, it should be noticed that the rule expressly limits the grant of the Union's aid to disputes concerning hours and wages.

Secondly, the Executive has apparently the power to decide whether the dispute is justifiable, and only if it choose to consider it so, "it is the duty" of the Executive to submit the circumstances to the members. The Executive may then take a vote of the membership. Notice that the expression is *may* not *must*.

The workers on any vessel or in any port should have the right to claim that their case be submitted to the other branches of the Union for decision.

The following rules governing strike pay have been adopted by the Building Workers' Industrial Union, and are worthy of notice:—

A strike must be sanctioned by the branch or district committee before dispute pay can be obtained. The power to close a strike shall be vested in the majority of the votes of the whole of the members.

When a dispute occurs the Strike Committee must be elected by the members engaged in the dispute: such Strike Committee shall conduct the dispute in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Union.

It shall be the duty of the Executive Committee to grant immediate benefit and support to members involved in any trade dispute for the purpose of defending and maintaining the accepted standard rate of pay, or recognised working conditions; but where any branch or district intends to apply for increased wages or better conditions, such branch or district shall supply the Executive Council with

all the information; the Executive Council to submit immediately the whole facts to the members, who shall endorse the movement before any benefit is granted.

Members Should Control Negotiations and Policy.

All important strikes and questions of policy should be made the subject of delegate conferences. There are only forty branches of this Union and delegates of the branches (or from the ports) not merely from the seven districts, should attend these conferences.

An important rule of the South Wales Miners' Federation states:—

If at any time any circumstances arise which are likely to endanger the interests of the Federation or its members, either industrially or politically, or if any question on which the rules are silent calls for determination or decision, a special conference shall be convened to decide the policy which the Federation shall pursue.

The South Wales Miners' Federation also gives to the annual or special delegate conference, instead of to the Executive, the power to decide whether a ballot vote shall be taken.

It is well known that the South Wales Miners' delegates have no power to close strikes or make binding decisions in important negotiations without reporting back to the delegate conference.

This rule should obtain in every Union and resolutions to this effect should be tabled for the next conference by those who wish to give the seamen and firemen an effective voice in the management of their Union.

(To be continued.)

UNITED VEHICLE WORKERS.

Rank and File Movement.

Meeting, Tuesday, April 6th, well attended. Discussion took place on the paltry award to the Tram Workers, their wage even now being only 12/6 per day as against the Dockers 16/-. What an object lesson on the absolute futility of the Joint Industrial Councils under the Whitley Scheme, to which the Tram Workers belong. Busmen have refused to join a Joint Industrial Council and prefer direct negotiation. Good luck to them.

The following resolution was carried unanimously, "That the Secretary be instructed to get into touch with the rebel element among the Tram Strikers at Manchester, Oldham, Huddersfield, Bradford and Birmingham, write them on the work of our Rank and File Movement in London, and suggest they form local Vigilance Committees to watch the Officials, and work for Mass Solidarity for Action among the membership, and that they link up with the London Movement in its work in revolutionising and democratising the constitution of the Union."

Brother Bonfrere, in speaking to this, said he hoped this did not mean whitewashing the Ceiling of Hyde Park as so many resolutions mean, but that it really meant getting the facts in front of the members. He warned the membership to beware of potential leaders equally with the present Leaders, and instanced "Direct Actionists" who had gone wonky. Of course, Parliamentarians never go wonky.

The manner in which Robert Williams conducted the Tram Negotiations was severely criticised by members who were present, it being aptly put that if you get a commission to sell a watch for ten shillings you don't ask the bloke right away if he will give you six for it, without privately consulting your client.

It was resolved to circularise all Tram Branches, pointing out to them the futility of the Whitley Committees and recommending them to press for an immediate withdrawal for such scheme. It was stated that the preliminary agenda for the forthcoming Annual Delegate Meeting of the Union ran to two thick volumes and consisted of some thousands of resolutions. The clever people who tied the members up in an amalgamated Rulebook, to which the members never agreed, will now find their Official Smartness recoiling on their own heads. It also transpires that London will swamp the delegate meeting in point of number of delegates, and this can only be altered by a decision of two-thirds of the membership. More Cleverness. You cannot fool all the people all the time.

NEW SOVIET LEAFLET.

Explains in simple language what the Soviets have done in Russia, and could do here: gives plan of Soviet structure that all may understand.

Price 1d. each, 100 for 2/9.

Communism and the Family, by Alexandra Kolontay Russian Soviet Commissary for Social Welfare.

Price FOURPENCE.

Published by the WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION, 400, OLD FORD ROAD, E. 3.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation.
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor:
400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3.
TELEPHONE: EAST 1787.

Business Communications to the Manager:
"Workers' Dreadnought," 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.
TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 7240.

SUBSCRIPTION:			
THREE MONTHS	Post Free	2/3
SIX MONTHS	"	4/6
ONE YEAR	"	8/6

Vol. VII., No. 4. Sat., April 17, 1920.

HENDERSON ON INTERNATIONALISM.

It is very interesting (though also disgusting) to find "comrade" Henderson, ex-member of the War Cabinet, coming forth as an exponent of what the Socialist International should be. He speaks of a "definite Socialist objective," which, he says, is to be that of the forthcoming Second International Conference at Geneva.

We ask Henderson whether he now declares himself a Socialist of any kind; whether he subscribes to the principle that capitalism must be abolished and the entire sources and machinery of production, distribution, and exchange must be vested in the community? Let his answer on that point be the first test of his sincerity, though in the case of a man with a record like his, no mere verbal test can be conclusive. The *Daily Herald* protests: "We do not want any heresy-hunting or exclusiveness on the basis of the past views or activities of individuals or sections during the war."

It says this because it wants to keep Henderson within the *Herald* fold. Friendship with him has proved too good an asset in securing support from the Trade Unions to be dropped, although the policy of Henderson is very far removed from the *Herald* pacifism.

But the circle of the *Daily Herald's* readers and supporters is not the Third International. The *Herald* may, if it chooses, take "let them all come and buy our newspaper" as its motto. In its pursuit of a varied circulation, it may make itself a hotch-potch of conflicting policies; but such a policy cannot be followed by those who desire to mould a coherent body of opinion and to change the structure of society. The *Herald's* disclaimer of "heresy-hunting" is a plea for the white-washing of the social traitors who, during the past six years, have worked in close alliance with the capitalists against the workers.

Foremost amongst these is Arthur Henderson. It is not surprising that he should be opposed to joining the Third International. Was he not a member of the War Cabinet when the Intervention in Russia started? Was he not sent by Lloyd George's Government to take the place of the British representative in Petrograd, Sir George Buchanan, and did he not return, leaving Sir George Buchanan in office, because Sir George Buchanan's policy exactly coincided with his own? And even when he left the War Cabinet; did not Henderson urge that Labour should remain in the coalition, and maintain the political truce?

Arthur Henderson's influence in the Second International has been a sinister one; he has used the power of the British Labour Party's great purse to corrupt the Second International to the service of the capitalist governments.

Jean Lonquet, in *Le Populaire* of April 5th, recorded that in the old days the representatives of the big British Trade Unions went to an International Congress as though to "a vast picnic," and were wholly inattentive, even to the most passionate debates. But the present directors of the Labour Party, and especially Arthur Henderson, have changed all that; and although perhaps the British delegates may still contribute but poorly to the speeches, the financial contribution of the Labour Party has lately been most substantial. Says Lonquet: "For the Berne Conference, and for the reunions of Amsterdam and Lucerne much of the expenses were borne by the Labour Party, which made itself responsible for a large part of the cost that the International Socialist Bureau could not bear."

And how has the British Labour Party Executive, under the direction of Henderson, used its great power? We remember the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference in London, in which the British Labour Party had arranged for itself an absolute majority of votes over all other parties and Kerensky, the traitor, was there on the invitation of the Labour Party. That conference set the hall mark of its assent on the Allied attack on Soviet Russia. It pledged itself to support the Allied Governments in a fight to a finish against the Central Empires. It adopted President Wilson's fourteen points as its own policy. It again flouted the Socialists of the Central Empires and declared against further efforts to convene the International.

When the Second International met at Berne in January, 1919, it developed from the basis outlined by the Inter-Allied Conference in London; it declared against the Russian Communists and for bourgeois democracy as opposed to the proletarian dictatorship; it pledged its support to the capitalist League of Nations and produced a programme of International Labour Legislation of so luke-warm a character that the Allied Governments have accepted it practically as it stood.

In all the reformist doings of the Second International Henderson has been one of the dominant figures; his policy is even more reactionary at home. The suggestion that there is room for such policies as his in the Third International is manifestly absurd; yet the *Daily Herald* is prepared to welcome him there and Clifford Allen, one of the new members of the I.L.P. Executive, is begging Henderson to go with his colleagues to Russia and then with the full facts in his possession to "come back and summon the new International."

We can only say that Allan appears to us to be playing with politics when he writes thus.

The Second International is on its death-bed; there is now a scramble for official positions in a new International. But to some people the Third does not yet look quite comfortable or safe; hence they are trying their hands at reconstruction.

As even the *Herald* admits, Henderson deliberately misrepresents the facts regarding the two Internationals, and in nothing more than in regard to the Italian parties. He declares that the Italian Socialist Party has not found unity or salvation in the Maximilist Kremlin. But he must surely be aware that there is very much more unity of purpose in the Italian Party than in the British Labour Party, and that Modigliani, Lazzari and Turati represent minorities which are growing smaller. He also knows that it was when Lazzari was secretary of the Italian Socialist Party that that Party broke away from the Second International and that Lazzari was in whole-hearted agreement with the step. Henderson tells us that Italy is represented at the Second International by the Party of Bissolati; he cannot be ignorant of the fact that the Italian Reformists are a mere small group of reactionary hangers-on of the capitalist Government, and that they cannot be called the party of Bissolati.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

JACK MILLS, M.P.

The Labour Party victory at Dartford by the enormous vote of 13,610 to 4,562 for the candidate who came next on the poll, shows that the workers are turning away from the old capitalist Parties.

It is specially interesting to notice that Jack Mills was not an official trade union candidate and that the campaign was started with only enough money to nominate him, but in three weeks over £800 was raised in workshop and trade union branch collections. We wish we could say that his big vote was unmistakably cast for Socialism, but we cannot.

Mills told the *Daily Herald* that he won because he "fought on the straight Socialist programme with no camouflage." Then he went on to explain:—

"The chief point of my campaign was public ownership of mines and the 'key' industries with democratic control. . . I also stressed the Labour Party's policy of taxation to relieve the housewife from the cruel burden of taxes on food."

At the risk of seeming churlish towards a candidate flushed with victory after putting up so energetic a fight, we cannot refrain from pointing out that the nationalisation of key industries and the taxation of capital are not Socialism; Socialism entails the complete abolition of capitalism and the Socialisation of all industries. Under Socialism there will be no capitalists to tax.

THE MOTHERS COMPLAIN

The four pound loaf now costs from 1/- to 1/2. Working-class mothers are finding the increased cost a tremendous burden; they complain that the task of making both ends meet is becoming altogether too difficult for them.

Of course it is; and there will be no relief until the workers step in and end the capitalist system. Every working woman should realise that and make up her mind to take her part in the struggle. She can begin by trying to organise a Soviet in her own street.

THE GERMAN SITUATION.

There is not much doubt that the Allied Capitalist Governments were agreed that if the Germans could not put down the Communist workers the Allies would march in and do it. The French occupation had been in progress some days before the British made a complaint. Then Lloyd George protested and was attacked by the Northcliffe Press for so doing. There are various schools of thought amongst Capitalist politicians, and though they may forget their differences when Labour threatens, they squabble briskly enough at other times. The present disagreement between Lloyd George and the Northcliffe faction is, we think, largely make believe and very superficial. The *Times* says Lloyd George's protest to France arose because he had been spending Easter with the Liberal Quaker, Rowntree, but we think it much more likely that he was influenced by British coalowners and manufacturers anxious to guard against the possibility of France gaining a permanent hold on the coal in the Ruhr Valley. Capitalist diplomacy has two guiding motives: the contest for raw materials and trading opportunities and the determination to maintain the Capitalist system against the workers.

Much horror is being worked up because the French Army of Occupation is mainly manned by African troops; but the French have been using black troops all along in the occupied territories of Germany—we saw them ourselves last winter—yet the stories of rape and outrage are only now being told. Why is this?

We must guard against the tendency to let our imaginations run riot under the influence of race prejudice on this question, yet undoubtedly the women of the districts concerned are victimised to a certain extent, and this is also the case where European troops are in occupation.

The story that the mayors of the occupied towns are called on to supply brothels for the use of the occupying troops, to furnish them, and to provide fuel for them is undoubtedly true, and during last winter, when German families could not get fuel, the order that there should be fuel for burning in the brothels both day and night was a burning grievance.

There seems no doubt that the Reds have been overwhelmed in the Ruhr area, but the Workmen's Councils seem to be getting the upper hand in the Saxony, Halle and Middle Germany.

The Revolution will assuredly rise again before long.

The Dombrowa miners and other Polish workers, who struck against the militarisation of the railways and other public services, were ordered back to work by their Trade Unions and by the reactionary Polish Socialist Party; but led by the Communist Party, they stood firm, and compelled the Government to withdraw its proposal.

ROSA LUXEMBURG AND LEO YOGICHES.

From Personal Memories. By I. MARCHLEWSKI (Karski).

PART II.

In the year 1897, after passing through the University, Rosa Luxemburg resolved to go to Germany; to acquire the possibility of public influence she went through a form of marriage with one of the sons of Doctor Lübeck, thus acquiring a German naturalisation. She worked among the Polish workers in Posen and Silesia, and at the same time wrote for German papers, and the theoretical party-organ, *Neue Zeit*. I had gone to Germany a year before, and worked in Dresden on an organ whose editor was Parvus. But in the year 1898 we were both turned out of Saxony, and Rosa Luxemburg was mentioned to the editor of the *Dresdener Zeitung*. She could not, however, adapt herself there, and soon began to collaborate on the *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, whose editor was Schönang, the best German journalist of the time. After his death she edited this organ for some time.

A crisis was then beginning in the German labour movement: Bernstein made himself heard, and Revisionism began to spread. Rosa Luxemburg threw herself into the polemics of it, and her brilliant articles helped to define the tactical line. Soon the question of tactics was on the tapis for all Europe: the question of the participation by Socialists in Bourgeois Governments (the so-called "Millerandism") arose. And there began everywhere a sharp battle between the Reformist and the Revolutionary tendency. In this battle the dialectical and polemical talent of Rosa Luxemburg made itself felt in all its power: she soon became one of the most prominent champions of the Revolutionary tendency. The Polish Socialist Party appointed her a member of the International Bureau, and she since then uninterruptedly carried on the fight for revolutionary ideas in the widest sense. Here, again, her inseparable collaborator was Jogiches. It is well known to Rosa's intimates that she handed over to the printer no single polemical or programme article before submitting it to his inspection.

At the same time neither of the two comrades interrupted their work for the Polish movement. The abode of Rosa Luxemburg in Friedenau (a suburb of Berlin) was the centre toward which the comrades coming from Warsaw betook themselves to debate on all question that arose; thither, too, went Comrade Jogiches, in whose hands were collected the threads which connected the party in Poland with the comrades who, in the Emigration, worked for the Party.

So passed in continual battle for revolutionary ideas the years 1877-1905. In this fight Rosa Luxemburg rendered ever-memorable services to the proletariat, never departing a step from the express lines of revolutionary Marxism. It is characteristic of her personality that, in spite of the complete ruthlessness, and sometimes even excessive zeal of her polemics, her opponents (among whom were Jean Jaurès and Bebel) exhibited toward her, not only reverence, but even love. She lived at that time in close friendship, too, with Karl Kautsky, upon whom in those years she exercised great influence, urging him forward when he showed opportunist leanings.

There broke out the Russian Revolution of 1905-1906, and the Polish proletariat proved itself in the death-struggle a reliable ally. Comrade Jogiches hastened to Warsaw. Thither, too, Rosa was urged. In vain we all declared that she must remain in Berlin, as we all needed her scientific work, for which in Poland she would not be able to find suitable condition. In spite of our categorical prohibition she arrived one fine morning with a German passport in Warsaw. Tyszkas—Jogiches had now adopted this pseudonym—was angry, but Rosa declared that he must accommodate himself to the fact that she was not, at any cost, going to abandon her post; and she began to work on our journal.

But it did not last long: a couple of weeks later she fell into the hands of the Ochranka (Russian political secret police), who soon put her under lock and key. Happily, about that time there began, even within the political

secret police, a process of disintegration. By the threat that our fighting organisation would avenge himself grimly for Rosa on the "Ochranka," and by bribes, we managed to secure her freedom on bail; and soon thereupon the comrades sent her back abroad; she protested, but this time we were firm.

At the same time as she, Tyszka, too, fell into the pit. He employed the whole time in a brilliant activity. Thanks to him, our journal was excellently conducted. He introduced a severe order into the editorship, which was carried on in a secret house in the centre of the town. According to his custom, he himself did not write, but not only every article, but almost every par., was written by his direction, "in order that our whole number, from beginning to end, might be, as it were, poured out of a single crucible"; and not a single line went to the printers that he had not carefully inspected. He kept his collaborators under strict discipline, and allowed neither weariness nor moods to count. "One must work, that is all"; and, as we saw him indefatigable from morning till evening, all permitted themselves to be carried away by this excellently organised work. It was not only the literary side which he sharply saw to; he neglected nothing in respect of the compositors and craftsmen either. God help anyone who had not used the type for a par. which had been prescribed on the manuscript. Look out if a number of the paper did not embody all the rules of the printer's art! And loose work in the distribution was an unforgivable crime. The unhappy craftsman had to hear reproaches even after a month when once five ordered copies arrived late at a certain place.

He remembered everything, saw to everything. And yet outside of the work of editing he was carrying on an immense work of organisation: he knew minutely the whole progress of the party-work, and followed all unweariedly. But this work did not rob him of a wide outlook; in all questions of tactics he distinguished himself by an eminent dominance and largeness of vision.

He was arrested at the same time as Rosa Luxemburg in February, 1906, was recognised, was arraigned and condemned to eight years in the House of Correction. But in February, 1907, the comrades managed to accomplish his escape from prison. This had been organised by Comrade Ganetzki: the warder was bribed, a suit of clothes was procured for Tyszka, and he was got out. I remember that he came straight from the prison to the office, where he had to remain several days, until we could manage to find him a safer dwelling. All was not going so well with the editing: his collaborators were nearly all in prison; it was ever more difficult to keep the printing going; and our paper was already no longer so elegant as formerly. Tyszka, to begin with, asked for all the past numbers, looked through them, and fell into a rage: a mass of printers' errors! I pointed out that the corrector had had to do his work, now sitting by the machine, and now in prison. But that was not convincing to Tyszka. "A head and two hands are needed to make the corrections; so long as the head is on the shoulders, and the hand can hold a pencil, it is all one where the man works." In fact, Tyszka was able to work in that way. He sat down and wrote over-night a set of instructions, which seemed to him necessary to mend matters.

After he had successfully passed the frontiers—I remember that a revolutionary officer took him in a carriage to the frontier—Tyszka at once turned to work.

(To be continued.)

A Three Months Subscription for 2/3.

In order to save expense to Comrades, both in town and country, who cannot obtain the "Dreadnought" from a neighbouring newsagent, we have decided to reduce the rates for future subscriptions and to send the paper POST FREE to any address in the United Kingdom for
2/3 for THREE months,
4/6 for SIX months,
and 8/6 for a YEAR'S subscription.

PARLIAMENT AS WE SEE IT.

Disabled Nurses.

A question was asked about the nurses injured in the war, for whom "the Nation's Fund for Nurses" is being organised. The reply was that the War Office is not responsible for nurses employed by the British Red Cross or other organisations. That is the usual thing under capitalism: only the people who have got money invested are safe. It is no use getting excited about one of these injustices, and it is like carrying water in a sieve to try to remedy them. The system must be changed.

Still in Russia.

It was promised that the British military forces would be withdrawn from South Russia and Siberia by March 31st, but the Government admitted they are still there.

Special Constables. -- For What?

Mr. Shortt admitted that the reserves of special constables are being strengthened and that special appeals to ex-service men are being made to join this force. Why are more police wanted? To look after the workers?

Jerry-Building by Government Order.

Day by day it is revealed that the Government is compelling the local authorities to make the houses they are building for the workers cheap and therefore nasty. On March 29th Dr. Addison admitted he had ordered that first-rate building materials must not be used. On March 30th it came out that the Scottish Local Government Board insists that ceilings shall not be more than 8ft. 6in. high on the ground floor and 8ft. high upstairs. Many stonemasons are out of work in Dumfries. Nevertheless, the Government does not allow Scottish local authorities to build stone houses unless the cost of building in stone "is reasonable in comparison with the cost of brick." But Mr. Workman has not yet realised that capitalist Governments rate his importance very low.

Health Ministry and C.W.S.

MARCH 31st.—The National Health Insurance Commissioners have refused to allow the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives' approved section to invest moneys in the Co-operative Wholesale Society. Dr. Addison refused to reconsider the decision.

That Jolly War!

4,000 discharged soldiers and sailors are in public lunatic asylums. The Government has "no intention" of providing other accommodation for them.

Landlords on the Make.

A Liverpool firm in 1916 rented premises at £315 a year and laid down concrete foundations. The rent has gone steadily up and will be £1,600 in September. Small shopkeepers are being held up to ransom.

These are natural effects of the capitalist system. There are 102 D.O.R.A. prisoners interned in British prisons.

M.P.s Arrested.

The Speaker informed the House that he had received letters notifying the arrest under D.O.R.A. of three Irish M.P.'s.

An ex-soldier suffering from tuberculosis has been five months in Barnstable Workhouse in spite of appeals to the Pensions Ministry.

Salaries at the Ministry of Munitions amount to £29,983 per week.

The U.S. Navy.

Walter Long, First Lord of the Admiralty, said that whereas the estimates for the U.S. Navy exceed those of Britain by £1,000,000, at normal rate of exchange; at current rate they amount to £44,000,000 more than the British. The British Naval personnel is 136,000, falling to 131,000 at the end of the year, whilst the American is approximately 147,000, and will be 177,000 by the end of the year.

Presently the British Capitalist-Imperialists will raise the cry: "Increase the Navy." Only Communism can save us from another capitalist war. Speed the Workers' Revolution.

Will Thorne Wants Anti-Soviet Propaganda.

Will Thorne called attention to the Soviet train called "Lenin's car" which circulated half a million roubles' worth of books, papers and pamphlets, 150,000 free proclamations and reports, 1,500 posters and with which went 60 lecturers, whose lectures were attended by 100,000 workers, peasants and soldiers. Similar trains are being prepared for all parts of Russia.

Will Thorne (Lab.) wanted the British Government to organise a similar propaganda to tell the people "the true position" and "what Socialism means so that they will be able to distinguish between Bolshevism, Communism and Syndicalism." Thorne knows very well that no capitalist Government will ever tell the people what Socialism means. He was merely inciting the Government to a campaign of anti-Socialist lying. Thorne was the pupa of Karl Marx's daughter, Eleanor. Yet he has failed to master the essential fact of the class war. Bonar Law said the Government would use quieter methods of propaganda.

Capitalism and The Counter-Revolution, by J. T. Walton Newbold, M.A. A Marxist examination of important issues of immediate and practical significance that have been given all too little attention by the revolutionary elements in this country.

Price 3d., post free 3½d.

THE TWO INTERNATIONALS.

A Communication from the Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of the Third International.

Dear Comrades: Comrade Johnson, secretary of the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, had kindly sent us the copy of a letter addressed by the I.L.P. to the Swiss Socialist Party (P.S.S.). In this letter to the P.S.S. is invited to take the initiative for the organising in Switzerland of a conference of the several Socialist Parties, where the basis would be laid of the so-called "reconstruction" of the International.

As the *Labour Leader* of March 4th observes, the majority obtained at the Strassburg Conference by the Longuet resolution necessitates such a conference. Now that most of the parties of Central and Western Europe have left the Second International without deciding for Moscow, it seems that the formation of a new organism of a block of the parties hesitating between the old and the new tendencies, the formulas of the past and those of the future, is no longer to be avoided.

What is the character of this block likely to be? What, from a Communist point of view, is to be hoped for from the principal parties interested in its formation? The utter political weakness, the absolute lack of revolutionary firmness displayed by the majority of the leaders of the German Independent Socialist Party, Longuet's violent attacks on the Communist International at the Strassburg Congress, together with the inability or disinclination of the French Centrists to understand the world revolution as the unavoidable consequence of the World War, and at the same time as a process which may be more or less directed and hastened by the conscious will of a proletarian vanguard; these are, to mention only the three principal parties destined to form the nucleus of a "reconstructed" International, so many signs that the organism expected to be born from the conference which the I.L.P. proposes to the P.S.S., would only serve to sanction in a general way the feeble, ambiguous and vacillating policy pursued by men like Crispin, Hilferding, Pressemane, Macdonald and Snowden, after the War as before. The attempts of these parties, either to demand from Moscow "guarantees" for the admission of compromised leaders, and of deeds essentially hostile to Communist methods, or to form a new intermediary block between the Second and Third International, can have no other result but to weaken, to clog and hinder revolutionary action in the proletarian masses, and thus to hold back the formation of the Soviet system and the establishing of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Europe and in America.

The very terms of Comrade Johnson's letter to the P.S.S. are evidence that the basis of international Socialist unity, as contemplated by the I.L.P., have nothing whatever in common with the principles of unity laid down by the First Congress of

the Communist International, held at Moscow in 1919.

The letter mentions the possibility of constituting anew one single International, whilst allowing the most complete autonomy in the matter of liberty of action and of tactics for every individual country. This evidently means that the double dealings which have led to the disaster in which the Second International was wrecked, will be consciously, advisedly adopted as a new starting-point, and that the terrific catastrophe of the World War would have been of no benefit whatever to the proletariat. Each and every national party would be free to wage the war against its Capitalism and its ruling class in its own way, or even to substitute to the war the collaboration of the classes; the disciplined and centralised action of the workers of all countries, the international unity of tactics absolutely necessary in the Imperialist era would, from the beginning, be repudiated by the charter of the reconstructed International, and it is supposed that the Communist Parties will fall into this trap.

Comrade Johnson's letter says, further, that the new International will be able to embrace all the parties accepting as the principal basis of Socialism the collective ownership and use of the land and of the principal instruments of labour; in such a way the exploitation of the public services, as of industry in general, and of all that concerns the public wealth, falls to the State or to the Municipality, in order to increase the prosperity and the happiness of all citizens. This definition of the basis of Socialism is, evidently, absolutely insufficient from a Communist point of view; on the other hand, not only the Reformist and Social-Patriotic Parties, but many simple bourgeois reformists can straightway accept it. It seems absolutely to ignore the fact that the Capitalist ownership of the means of production can only be abolished after the downfall of the bourgeois state, and the revolutionary organs of the proletariat will have to be the means of transforming it into collective ownership. Comrade Johnson's definition apparently is contented with a State and Municipal Socialism, which would change nothing, or very little, in the social misery, and in the degradation of the workers, and which would even aggravate their dependency.

It seems to us, that for the Communist groups and parties to participate in a conference of the kind, would be a waste of energy, time and money; that it would be a real betrayal on their part of our principles and of the grand work of reconstruction pursued by Soviet Russia. The old fetish of "Socialist unity" (that worthy pendant of the equally dangerous and no less fatal class truce) will be made use of for an attempt to induce all more or less hesitating spirits to capitulate before double-

heartedness and lies. Phrase-mongering demagoguery, the pathetic appeals of able leaders, will only serve to cover the absence of ideal, of revolutionary faith (that is, of faith in the masses), of class-consciousness and of firmness.

It seems to us that the Communist groups and parties would commit an exceedingly grave fault by taking part in the conference of the "reconstructors." They would aggravate the confusion still obtaining amongst the masses, they would render it more difficult for them to free themselves of the old formulas and the old fetishes (democracy, peaceful evolution, Socialist unity, etc.), and to consciously orientate themselves toward the Communist theory and tactics.

That is why we are of opinion that the British Socialist Party in Great Britain and the Committee for the Third International in France have done well and acted as Communists should, by absolutely refusing to participate in any conference of reconstruction, as the new International, which answers to the needs and the aspirations of the working-class in the era of the world revolution, already exists. And we ardently hope that the example of these British and French comrades will be followed by all Communist groups and parties.

We in no wise wish to dictate rules of conduct to the advanced groups of countries where a Communist Party does not yet exist, or is only in a nascent state. Evidently these groups are themselves the sole judges in the question of the exact moment when they will think it necessary either to leave the old parties to which they now belong, in order to constitute a Communist Party and affiliate to Moscow, or to prevail upon the majority of these parties, the necessary process of cleaning having been effected, to follow them. But we feel we failed in the fulfilling of the mandate entrusted to us by the Amsterdam Conference, if we neglected to warn our Communist friends against the very real new-confusionist danger constituted by the founding of an International lacking a precise conception and a definite character. The attempt at re-establishing the so-called Socialist unity is a dangerous snare into which the spirit of criticism and the spirit of truth may equally be decoyed. The only real living and efficacious unity is the one which has for its base not only the formal acceptance of the Communist principles and theory, but, above all, the revolutionary practice arising out of this theory. And, in order to constitute on the national as on the international territory this real and living unity, we must as well have the courage to reject nationally the traditional plea for unity, as to refuse on the international field to lend a hand towards the formation of an organism built on the sands of lies and illusions, and fatally destined to confusion and impotency.

The Executive of the Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of the Third International:

D. J. WYNKOOP.
HENRIETTE ROLAND HOLST.
G. J. RUTGERS.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS.

From the Russian Council of Trade Unions.

A "Rosta" telegram of March 12th states that the authorised representative of the All Russian Council of Trade Unions, and especially of the Russian Metal Workers, Alexander Shiliapnicoff, who is also a member of the first Soviet Government, has arrived in Scandinavia to renew connections with the International Labour organisations. He has telegraphed the object of his journey to the British General Federation of Trades, to the Confederation General du Travail in France, to the General Kommission der Gewerkshaftern in Germany, to the Confederazione del Lavoro in Italy, and to the office of the Trade Union International in Amsterdam. He expects the working classes of these countries to bring pressure to bear on their Governments to allow him to enter.

Commissions are now being organised in many countries consisting of representatives of employers' and so-called workers' representatives to study the situation of Soviet Russia. The talk of the necessity for sending such missions is especially great in those countries, the Governments of which have done everything possible to make the condition of Russia intolerable, by supporting the Russian counter-revolution, and by sending their own soldiers against the Soviets.

Before joining any such missions it would be useful for the workers to receive information about the situation of Soviet Russia from eminent representatives of the Russian proletariat. We believe that the Labour organisations in all countries desire to know the truth about Soviet Russia from its own representatives, and we hope that these organisations will do all they can to enable their Russian comrades to travel freely.

Meeting Petrograd Soviet.

A "Rosta" Wireless from Moscow reports that on March 13th there was a solemn sitting of the Petrograd Soviet in the Uristzki Palace to commemorate the third anniversary of the February (March) Revolution. The proceedings were opened by Lashevitch, who gave a warm welcome to Zinoviev as President of the Petrograd Soviet. He was followed by Ioffe, who gave his reminiscences of the February revolution in far off Siberia, where he was in exile. He invited his hearers to do homage to the memory of those fallen in the revolutionary fight. The orchestra played "You Fell as Victims."

A number of workers then gave their impressions of the February revolution.

The President of the Young Communists, Kononov, said: "Red youth marches hand in hand with the older comrade in the path of revolution. It does not lag behind you, and it will continue your work."

The following message was sent to comrade Trotzki: "On the day of the third anniversary of the downfall of autocracy the Petrograd proletariat sends fraternal greetings to the leader of the invincible Red Army. The Red regiments, having withstood the pressure of the whole imperialistic world and having beaten the enemies of the revolution on all the fronts, are now, under your guidance, making war at the bloodless front against hunger, cold, and ruin. In this fight the victory will be ours."

The following resolution was passed by the Soviet: "To the workers of the world. On the day of the third anniversary of the downfall of autocracy in Russia the Petrograd Soviet, the district representatives, the Conference of the Baltic Fleet, and the non-party Conference of workers' organisations, send fraternal greetings to the workers of the entire world. They feel sure that they have friends in the enemy camps, and that the workers in all lands are thinking and feeling as they do. To-day, the revolutionary proletariat is calling to new battles and fresh victories. Long live the international proletarian revolution, long live Communism!"

Russian Trade Union Congress.

A Rosta Agency wire of March 12th, from Moscow via Stockholm, announces that Lenin, addressing the Congress of Russian Industrial Unions on economic questions and the organisation of workers and peasants in the transition period, has emphasised the need to overcome all classes and class distinctions, especially between the industrial workers and the peasants, who are both workers and small property owners. Without the collaboration of the peasants and the industrial workers, Socialism will never be realised. The industrial workers, who are the advanced guard in the class struggle, ought to play the principle part; but enthusiasm and devotion to the common object is essential. The dictatorship of the proletariat is legitimate, for the peasant masses lack the self-discipline possessed by the industrial workers. Thanks to this discipline they have triumphed over capitalist powers that are stronger than they in cannon and in dreadnoughts.

No State has had so many congresses as Soviet Russia during these last years. No State has developed so democratic a spirit. The decisions of Soviet Russia enjoy an authority amongst the people

unequaled by those of any Government. This is the foundation of its power. Lenin went on to explain that the organisation of the Russian working class takes larger and larger forms. It exists only to aid the working class to achieve its object. That object can only be attained by disciplined work. Meanwhile it is indispensable to have organic cohesion and moral education, and more discipline, more personal responsibility, more dictatorship. The army and the industrial unions number 3,000,000, amongst whom are 600,000 Communists. These Communists should be the advance guard of the three millions. It is necessary to set aside the interests of particular groups and associations, in order to secure the final victory. Having heard the speeches of Lenin and others, the Congress decided:—

1. To address to all Russian workers an appeal to join in common accord in an energetic fight against the economic crisis.
2. To introduce immediately into all organisations a severe discipline, in order that they may be models of exactitude and rapidity.
3. To continue to induce the workers to take part in political affairs under the direction of the Communist Party.

The Congress opened on April 8th, and 2,000 delegates were present.

Radek on Bolshevism.

Radek, in the Russian *Pravda*, declares that the great influence of Bolshevism on the International movement began in 1914, when the Bolshevik Party analysed exactly the causes of the failure of the Second International, and issued the clear call to civil war as a means of overcoming imperialist war. The European Marxists had not the courage to look truth in the eyes, and break with the Social traitors. Bolshevism has given to the European masses the Soviet idea.

The British in Archangel.

The Russian *Krasnaya Gazeta*, reporting on the result of the British occupation of Archangel, says that when the British commander arrived in the town five new prisons were immediately opened; the Custom House and hospitals were made into prisons. During one year in the northern districts occupied by the British, where the population is 400,000, the British passed 38,000 people into their prisons. Of these persons 8,000 were shot, and 1,020 died of disease. Relatively to the population of Russia the number of executions in the British area of occupation was 400 times greater than in Soviet Russia throughout the civil war.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN BRITAIN.

In reviewing the class struggle during the War period one sees the workers labouring under the disability of fighting behind leaders who persisted in denying the existence of the class struggle. Having declared that the workers of this country were vitally interested in winning the war against the Central Empires, the Labour Leaders could only attack the Government on side issues. They had pledged themselves not to hinder, but actually to help in the prosecution of the War.

Therefore, whilst they demanded for Labour a share of Control in marshalling and disposing of the Labour resources of the country, that simply meant that Trade Union Officials found themselves on Munitions Tribunals and Labour Advisory Boards, endeavouring to force from the workers a higher output and bigger profits for the employers. It is true that the Labour Leaders declared it unfair to conscribe the workers for National Service, without at the same time conscribing the wealth of the capitalists, but the conscription of wealth, which if fully achieved, entails Socialism, could only be carried out by entering into a fight with the capitalists, and the Labour Leaders had pledged themselves to National Unity and Industrial Peace in order to win the War. Therefore, they offered no real opposition to conscription, because the Government made them believe conscription necessary to win the War, and therefore also, they found themselves on tribunals, helping to administer the conscript system the Labour conferences had instructed them to oppose.

The great masses were influenced by the Labour Leaders, the capitalist newspapers, and the primitive fears and passions aroused by the news that their country was at war and might be invaded. Nevertheless, the masses were under the economic pressure from which the Labour Leaders were largely emancipated; it was the masses who bore the extra burden of hard toil in workshops and trenches involved by the War. The gigantic commercial transactions in war material, the swift upward movement of prices, the building of huge fortunes; all these revealed the capitalist system to larger and larger circles of workers, to whom it was as though a searchlight had been thrown upon what had been wholly or partially hidden in darkness hitherto. The demand for workers' control was now urged by at least a group of exponents in every industry. From the propaganda of these awakened workers and the opportunism, ignorance and clouded vision of the Labour Leaders, who saw half with surprise, half with dismay, that the rank and file were surging up against the shackles of their restraining leadership, a confused propaganda resulted. Thus, workers are demanding Nationalisation of their industries and meaning something that approximates to Communism, whilst Trade Union Officials and Labour and Liberal Politicians are demanding Nationalisation and meaning something very different. The miners who demanded Nationalisation, now faced with a Government refusal to grant Nationalisation and the refusal of the Trade Union Congress to strike for it, are falling back on demands for increased wages. A writer in the *Labour Leader* says that the miners are "like mice who, tired of trying to gnaw through their capitalist cage, are turning again to the treadmill." But the *Labour Leader* correspondent is wrong. What we are witnessing amongst the miners is the contest for leadership of the rank and file between the Communist Revolutionaries and the opportunist Trade Union Leaders, whose policy, when it can be called a policy, is merely one of palliatives. The Revolutionaries cannot wholeheartedly fight for the official programme, and the miners, instinctively realising that it would not alter their conditions, may more easily be moved to fight for something that brings an immediate and tangible benefit. The Revolutionary rank and file are seeking to use the economic materialism of the masses to produce the industrial crisis which the Trade Union Leaders are helping Capitalism to avert. The Revolutionaries are endeavouring to make the capitalist system unprofitable.

When the economic situation produces the next great wave of unrest in Britain, we shall find that Communist ideas have been steadily growing during the period of apparent calm.

A RECORD OF THE PAST SIX YEARS.

By A. FINEBERG.

The campaign for compulsory military conscription was closely bound up with the campaign for industrial conscription. The traditional repugnance to compulsory military service in England had always been very strong. Arguments for the regimentation of labour were easier to urge.

Industrial conscription, as such, was never introduced into England. "Dilution of labour," "substitution," "combing out," "the organisation of man-power," were, however, subtle euphemisms, serving to cloak a condition of affairs that eventually could not be distinguished from industrial conscription pure and simple. At each successive turn of the screw labour writhed and protested, but found itself impotent. At each successive step along the path the Government gave emphatic assurances that the idea of industrial conscription had never entered its head. Nevertheless, the advance was persistent and finally gained its objectives.

The struggle was as good as lost when the official Labour and Trade Union leaders went over in a body to the Government policy and became official recruiters and expounders of "patriotism." The rank and file found itself impotent, while its rights were gradually pilfered or ignored with the consent of its own leaders.

Immediately after the outbreak of war, a party truce was signed between the Liberal, Conservative and Labour Parties, by which it was agreed that there should be no contested elections. This truce, in the first place, was to hold until January 1st, 1915, and was subsequently renewed at various dates.

This political truce was accompanied by a truce in the industrial field. On August 24th, 1914, a special conference of the Joint Board of the Trade Union Congress, the General Federation of Trade Unions, and the Labour Party passed the following resolution:—

"That an immediate effort be made to terminate all existing trade disputes, whether strikes or lock-outs, and wherever new points of difficulty arise during the war period, a serious attempt should be made by all concerned to reach an amicable settlement before resorting to a strike or lock-out."

The number of industrial disputes fell considerably during the first six months of the War. Trade Union leaders voluntarily postponed the claims of their members until after the War, declaring that Labour was prepared to make considerable sacrifices in the national cause, and the rank and file made no effective protest at first.

The industrial truce was not, however, to last long. It was soon discovered that the sacrifices were one-sided. It was naturally understood when Labour surrendered its claim that the employers would not take advantage of the sacrifice. But it was soon apparent that the employers showed no inclination to forego the profiteering. On the contrary, more and more profits were being piled up, owing to the special conditions arising out of the War. In six months they had increased by nearly 25 per cent. The Government showed no inclination to protect the public from the rapacity of profiteers, and by the end of the year the Labour movement was prepared to forsake the truce and resort to Trade Union effort. By February, 1916, the demands for increased wages became general in all industries, and were more or less successful, according to the strength of the Unions concerned. The strike of the Clyde workers was of special significance.

The Clyde engineers had determined to demand 2d. an hour increase of wages in June, 1914, before the outbreak of war, but the claim was deferred in accordance with the industrial truce, and put forward again in December to meet the considerable rise in prices. Repeated and protracted negotiations brought, first, offers from the employers of 1d. and then 1d. per hour increase. The men remained firm, and at a subsequent meeting of the employers and the Executive Committee of the A.S.E., a joint recommendation for an increase of 1d. per hour was put forward. The men were exasperated, and on February 16th, the strike began, and soon spread until half the engineers were out. The men repudiated their official leaders and the strike was kept together by the formation of the Central Withholding of Labour Committee. The Government intervened and proposed arbitration and the men resumed work. As the result of arbitration the men were offered an increase of 1d. per hour.

The renewed outbreak of Trade Union activity strengthened the determination of the controlling classes to smash the movement once and for all, by the regimentation of labour. A committee on production was appointed on February 4th, 1915, to enquire into "the best steps to be taken to ensure that the productive power of employers in engineering and shipbuilding establishments shall be made immediately available. . . ." The reports of the Committee dealt with bad timekeeping and the necessity for the increased production of shells and fuses for the Army, and recommended the abrogation of the demarcation rules, which separated the operations performed by the workers in different skilled crafts; also the dilution of skilled industries by the introduction of semi-skilled, unskilled, and

women workers, and the stoppage of strikes and lock-outs by the making of arbitration of disputes compulsory.

A Treasury Conference was held on March 17th, 1914. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd George), and the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Runciman), invited representatives of all the chief Trade Unions concerned in producing commodities connected with the War (engineering, shipbuilding, iron and steel trades and other metal trades, woodworkers, labourers, transport workers, woollen and boot and shoe trades). At this Conference an agreement was arrived at embodying most of the recommendations of the Committee on Production.

This signing away by the Trade Union leaders of the privileges gained during sixty years of struggle, did not content Mr. Lloyd George. Plans were already being laid for another attack upon working-class liberties. An outcry was raised that the production of materials vital to the prosecution of the War was being restricted by habitual drunkenness on the part of the munition workers. The outcry was led by Mr. Lloyd George, who declared in the House of Commons that the country had three enemies: the Prussians, the Austrians, and "the lure of drink." The charges were proved to be groundless, and instigated by employers and Government officials to discredit workmen. Subsequent attempts made by Mr. Lloyd George to control liquor were defeated by the trade. The accusation of slacking and deliberate limitation of output were, however, continued.

In the Whitsun recess the Liberal Government collapsed, and the Coalition Government was formed. Labour was represented in the Government by Messrs. Henderson, Bruce and Roberts.

A new Ministry of Munitions was formed with Mr. Lloyd George at its head. He immediately brought forward plans for the organisation of labour and of industry, and on July 2nd, 1915, the Munitions Act was passed, whereby the first positive step towards the conscription of labour was accomplished. Hitherto, the restrictions placed on labour activities had been purely voluntary, consented to by the Trade Union leaders themselves. Under the Defence of the Realm Act (passed on March 16th), powers were obtained to commandeer private enterprises and to compel men to work as directed. There were, however, no legal powers to prevent individuals from changing their employment. These were provided by the Munitions of War Act.

Part I. gave legal sanction to the prevention of strikes, to which the Trade Union officials, in the Treasury Agreement, had already consented, and provided machinery for settling disputes by compulsory arbitration.

Part II. applied to establishments "controlled" by the Government on the ground that they were considered by the Minister of Munitions as vital to the prosecution of the War.

Clause 4 (3), provided for the abrogation of all Trade Union rules, practices and customs which tend to restrict production.

By Clause 7 (1), the liberty of a workman employed in a "controlled" establishment to leave, or change his employment was restricted by the leaving certificate:—

"A person shall not give employment to a workman, who has in the last previous six weeks, or such other period as may be provided by the Minister of Munitions, as respects any class of establishment, been employed in, or in connection with munitions work, or in any establishment of a class to which the provisions of this Section are applied by order of the Minister of Munitions, unless he holds a certificate from the employer by whom he was last so employed that he left work with the consent of his employer, or a certificate from the Munitions Tribunal that the consent has been unreasonably withheld."

In return for the surrender by the Trade Unions of their rights and privileges, the Act allowed the employers of "controlled" establishments to make a profit of one-fifth above that which they had made during the previous two years.

To be continued.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE SUPPLEMENT.

Our Next Week's Issue will contain another Supplement on the Class Struggle.

AN OLD COMRADE.

Frank Kitz, one of London's earliest revolutionary socialists, after the debacle of the First International, formed the first English section to support the German Communist Society in celebrating the anniversary of the Paris Commune. He then edited and published the English edition of *Freedom*, and afterwards became joint editor with David Nicol of the *Commonweal* after William Morris retired from the editorship.

This old comrade, now between 70 and 80 years of age, is having a hard struggle to live. A committee has been formed to raise a fund to help him. The treasurer is Frederick Flynn, 1, Culmstock Road, Battersea, S.W.

A Carnival is being arranged in connection with this fund at Battersea Town Hall, on May 5th, and tickets price 2/-, may be obtained from comrade Flynn.

Our contemporary, *Freedom*, is holding a Dance in support of its funds at Empress Hall, 128, Cambridge Road, E., on April 24th.

BETWEEN OURSELVES. By L. A. MOTLER.

All the country has been going wild over lost Lenore. One day she walked out of the house and was seen no more. And the press gives a list of the things she wore.

This may not be very good poetry, although the rhymes are all there, but it is a wholesome fact. And a fact sometimes is a lie and a half. When the papers say "all the country," they mean a few old grandmotherly journalists in Fleet Street. And this also includes the *Herald*, which brought out a poster in two colours to inform you what the capitalist press had informed you the night before.

Who is Lenore? So far as I can gather she is not on the staff of the *Herald*, nor is she one of their beautiful waitresses or factory girls. She does not appear to be a member of the League or even the Tsar's favourite dancer (saved at last from the bold Bolsheviks). Who is then the radiant maiden whom the *Herald* names Lenore? She is a boorjy and plays the fiddle.

Lenore, we are told, has fallen into the fell clutches of a villainous designing Frenchman of eighteen summers, or rather springs. Rumours of dope and other Bolshevik beverages are darkly hinted at. Whereat the *Herald* shudders and prints her full description for the seventh time. And no doubt the office sleuth fills his fountain pen and reaches for some choice phrases from a novel by Charles Garbage.

I have begun to think desperately of my forty-second best girl. She looks remarkably like the photo issued by the *Star*, although going by the one in the *Mail* she is quite safe. But supposing some enterprising reader of the *Herald* tracks her down and brings a crowd round by yelling "Lenore!" I can see my uncle Fitzarthur looking reprovingly at me and cutting off my Woodbine allowance.

At any rate it is interesting to know that a Labour paper keeps such a sharp look out on the misguided youth of the boorjoys. Perhaps the Labour Party may be induced to ask a question about it in Parliament (good idea to collect a few more votes for that Labour Government). Why not promote a Bill to build houses without front doors so that love-sick maidens will not be

tempted to go out one fine spring morning and follow the call of the heart?

The *Herald* once got so ferociously interested about a bleeding picture that it sent a special sleuth to France to track it down. Apparently he is still tracking it, for we do not hear of him now. Why cannot he be put on to track down Lenore? He may be more successful. And in order to give him a helping hand, suggest his looking up the registrar's. I make no charge for this brilliant clue.

And if a Labour paper can get on these things, why not extend such a brilliant idea? He might be able to track down quite a lot of interesting things and be able to record such items of interest to Labour as this. (*Star* 7/4/20):—

"MORGAN'S SPATS.—Among other things which Labour is showing us how to do is—the way to dress. It is said of Mr. Pole, the solicitor who is running as Labour candidate in North Edinburgh, that he might have stepped out of a fashion plate. Mr. Brace is another whose sartorial aspect is universally admired. And according to a photograph which I have just seen, Lieut-Col. D. Watts Morgan, D.S.O., the Welsh miners' leader, turned up at Ely races on Easter Monday in light spats."

It is hardly fair to the *Star* to nibble such Labour news items.

When the militarists began darkly hinting of a new Irish Rebellion at Easter, the *Herald* promptly sent one of its best sleuths to track it down. Last night, he came home with a mislaid it. It was an Irish Rebellion wandering around without an owner, let him get on the 'phone to Carmelite Street at once. It is such a pity such a bright young man should be disappointed.

But, nevertheless, I can see that the *Herald* is keeping a sharp look out on homeless mysteries and clues waiting to be picked up. That's the stuff to get a Labour Government in.

One can only hope that when the Revolution comes there won't be a big star feature on the front page, some sort of mysterious double suicide with lots of dope in it. Otherwise the Revolution will have to be content with a couple of lines in the "News from Home and Abroad."

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION

For Revolutionary International Socialism, the ending of Capitalism and Parliament, and the substitution of a Federation of Workers' Industrial Republics.

Membership open to all Men and Women. Subscription 4d. per month, 4s. per annum.

Write to the SECRETARY, 400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3. Telephone: East 1787.

LONDON MEETINGS: OUTDOOR.

- Friday, April 16th, Beckton Road, Canning Town, 7.30 p.m. Melvina Walker, Fred Tyler.
- Saturday, April 17th, Grundy Street, Poplar, 3 p.m. Mr. and Mrs. Edmunds, Melvina Walker.
- Dock Gates, Poplar, 7 p.m. Miss Grove, Henry Sara, Melvina Walker.
- Sunday, April 18th, Osborn Street, Whitechapel, 11.45 a.m. Harry Pollitt, Melvina Walker.
- Dock Gates, Poplar, 7.30 p.m. Henry Sara, Melvina Walker.
- Monday, April 19th, Stockwell Street, Greenwich, 7.30 p.m. Henry Sara, Melvina Walker.
- Friday, April 23rd, Manor Park Road, Harlesden, 7.30 p.m. Henry Sara and others.
- Saturday, April 24th. Meetings in Hammersmith.

INDOOR.

- Sunday, April 18th, Poplar Town Hall, 8 p.m. Public Meeting. (See advertisement.)
- Wednesday, April 21st, 400, Old Ford Road, at 8 p.m. General Members' Meeting. Chair: Sylvia Pankhurst.
- Friday, April 23rd, 400, Old Ford Road, 7 to 10 p.m. Dancing.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS.

- EAST LONDON WORKERS' COMMITTEE.
- Sunday, April 18th, Victoria Park, 12 (noon). Walter Ponder and others.
- Thursday, April 22nd, International Socialist Club, 28, East Road, City Road, 7.30 p.m. Business Meeting.
- WALTHAMSTOW LEAGUE OF RIGHTS.
- Tuesday, April 20th, William Morris Hall, Somers Road, 3 p.m. Jim Cant.

W.S.F. LITERATURE

W.S.F. Literature may now be obtained at the "Workers' Dreadnought" Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C.4., as well as at the Wholesale Department at 400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3.

W.S.F. PUBLIC MEETING
on SUNDAY, APRIL 18th, at 8 p.m.
(Doors open at 7.30 p.m.)

POPLAR TOWN HALL
(Newby Place, near Poplar Station)

Speakers:
SYLVIA PANKHURST, on GREAT BRITAIN.
Commander H. GRENFELL, R.N.
(Naval Attaché in Petrograd, 1912-17),
on RUSSIA.

CONOR HAYES, on IRELAND.
CHAIR - - - HARRY POLLITT.
Admission Free. Silver Collection.

TOYE & Co.

57, Theobalds Road, London, W.C.

Sole Manufacturer of Banners and Flags
for Demonstrations.
Metal and Enamelled Badges for all Societies.
Medals, Celluloid and Buttons.
Flags for Charity Collection Days.

BOARD RESIDENCE with comrades wanted in London.—Apply Box 10, "Workers' Dreadnought."

TO LET to comrades: furnished and unfurnished rooms, near London; 20 mins. railway journey from Liverpool Street; large garden.—Box 100, "Workers' Dreadnought."

Get your Newsagent to show
a Poster.

TO NATIONALISE THE SHIPPING.

Seamen Ballot on the Issue.

The National Sailors' and Firemen's Union is taking a ballot on the question of the Unions' attitude on nationalising the shipping industry, and the question is debated in a special issue of the Union's organ, the *Seaman*. Havelock Wilson defends the case against nationalisation. He says that the seamen have had four great champions in history: Lord Sandown, "a liberal-minded statesman"; Mr. Samuel Plimsoll, "a great philanthropist"; and the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, "another great man," and "at that time the most popular democratic leader of the age," and Havelock Wilson himself.

Wilson says that the other champions tried to improve the seaman's lot through Parliament, whilst he turned his attention to building up a strong seamen's union. He declares that the most formidable opponent of the seamen has been, not the private employer, but the State, and that when the shipowners have been attacked for sending men to sea in dangerous and insanitary ships, they have taken refuge in the retort that State regulations determine how ships shall be built and manned.

Wilson argues that the sailors would not get better wages or food under nationalisation, that the State is no more friendly to them than the private employer, and that they would find it harder to fight the State than the private employer. Moreover, he says, "the ships being owned by the State, the seamen will have to be part of a Naval Reserve."

He adds:—
"Proposals in this direction have already been made that all the men in the merchant service should be Reserve men, for which they would get a gratuity and, at the end of a period of service, a pension. If the State owns the ships this is certain to come along, so that men working on a State-controlled ship will be Reserve men and in the event of a strike could be mobilised at any time by a Government Proclamation."

"Now, assuming that the seamen organised a strike against the State-owned ships, and the State said this is against the public interest and must be stopped, they would simply issue a Proclamation to mobilise the men, who would have to go to the depots and await instructions, and the State could order them to go on the ships at once. The only men who would be free from this order would be those who were physically unfit or men over age; but there would be sufficient Reserve men to break a strike at any time; and if the State were short of Reserve men it could fall back on Naval ratings, and it would not be calling on these men to serve private employers, but would be calling on them to serve the State."

Wilson says if the State owns the shipping it must make it pay and that under State management more money than under private management will be squandered on official salaries, whilst 5 or 6 per cent. would be paid to the old owners. Therefore it would not readily make concessions to the workers. All that Havelock Wilson says is true; all the evils he predicts will undoubtedly come to pass under Nationalisation within the capitalist system. So long as the capitalist system is maintained around them, nationalised industries must be run on capitalist lines, the industries must be "made to pay" in the capitalist sense, and the workers will be sweated and overworked, whilst highly paid officialdom will draw the bulk of the profits arising from their labour, and the Government will continue to range itself on the side of capitalism and against the workers.

Havelock Wilson is answered by George Jackson and J. H. Borlase, who were deputed by the conference of the Union to state the case for nationalisation. They state that the total value of the vessels owned in the United Kingdom before the war was £140,000,000, and that the net profit made by British shipowners during the first two years of the war was £300,000,000, whilst the freight charges from the Argentine to Britain rose from 15/6 in the first quarter of 1914 to 170/- in July, 1916. In 1917 British shipping was requisitioned by the Government at arbitration rate of hire. In December, 1918, the Government freight charge was 42/- a ton, and the rate was high enough to enable the shipowners to make excess profits. In January, 1919, when shipping was decontrolled, the Atlantic Conference, a conference of shipping magnates which meets to regulate freight charge, fixed a rate of 93/4 a ton. This has contributed to the rise in the cost of living under which we are all suffering.

UNDER THE HARROW.

A soldier writes:—

"My money has been stopped by the Government. They have put me in debt through their neglect. My wife is pregnant and very weak. She only gets 16/- a week and has to pay 7/6 rent as well as insurance, etc. I am in debt to Jay's Furnishing Company, and if I do not pay them it means that my home will be taken away."

"I cannot rest here knowing my wife is in need of a meal or a crust and they have put me in detention for asking for my rights. This is my reward for fighting for my country and being a prisoner for two years in Russia and Germany."

Such cases are chronic under capitalism. Probably one of the frequent official mistakes. We have yet to investigate the details.

Printed by the AGENDA PRESS (T.U.), at 10, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4., and Published by the WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION, at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.