

Workers' Dreadnought

ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

VOL. VII. No. 34.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13th, 1920.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE MINERS' STRIKE.

A Defeat for the Workers.

The miners have been defeated in their present contest with the Government, the agent of capitalism. Such a result was inevitable, if the Government were determined on a fight to a finish. The miners' defeat was inevitable because they fought alone: they were opposed by a united capitalism and no other section of the workers came to their aid.

Who is to Blame?

Who is to blame for the failure of other sections of Labour to rally to the miners' support?

Firstly, the miners' leaders, who, so far from asking for support from others, actually discouraged it, because they were afraid to receive it lest a genuine struggle with the Government might arise. The miners' leaders worked for compromise before the strike and urged compromise throughout the strike.

Secondly, the blame rests with the leaders of the other working-class organisations.

Thirdly, it lies with the unreadiness of the rank and file and their toleration of Trade Union officials who have thrown in their lot with the master class.

The miners, alone, fighting against a united capitalism and all the forces of the Government, were obviously at the beginning of a long and desperate struggle. It is therefore not surprising that the strike was compromised, in view of the fact that the objects of the strike, which had been greatly whittled down by the leaders in the course of the negotiations, consisted, at last, merely of the demand for a wages increase of 2/- a shift, and the refusal to accept the datum line proposal to make wages depend on output.

The great struggle of the entire working class against united capitalism and its executive and the Government should be entered on, could we ordain the matter not for such pettifogging objects as this, but for the overthrow of capitalism itself. Nevertheless, we were for the strike; we desired that its objects might be enlarged, as they might have been in the course of the struggle, if other sections of workers had come along, but we were for the strike and a finish in any event.

The Gains of the Strike. The Losses of the Compromise.

The greatest achievement of the strike is the unmasking of those Labour leaders and Trade Union officials who are bolstering up the capitalist system—Brace and Hartshorn have seen the writing on the wall. The Left Wing, which is so vigorous in South Wales, has been active in focussing the attention of the rank and file on the speeches of these gentlemen. Hence Brace takes a Government post as adviser to the Ministry of Mines. Vernon Hartshorn resigns both his seat on the Miners' Federation Executive and his post of Miners' Agent for Maesteg. He intends to remain a member of Parliament, but he must not be too sure that he will be allowed to retain that position long, at least, as a representative of the Miners' Federation, for great changes of view are swiftly coming to pass amongst the miners.

The *Daily Herald* appealed for unity in the Miners' Federation, and announced that unity was complete, but under the headline "Men's Loyalty to Federation," it chronicled resolutions by Leigh and Fife miners calling for the resignation of the M.F.G.B. Executive, and a raid on the Union officers by dissatisfied Hamilton miners, who were cleared out by a police baton charge.

2s. a Shift and the Datum Line.

The compromise to which the miners will now be made parties, purely because their ballot did

not provide a two-thirds majority against it, gives them the 2/- a shift they demanded until the end of the year, so they have that bird in their hands to the good, and who knows but that the employers and the Government may have to whistle in vain for the putting into practice of the datum line provision? We certainly hope so.

The Datum Line provision, which makes wages dependent on output, is, of course, thoroughly bad. Robert Smillie and Frank Hodges both advised that the Government's terms should be accepted and the strike brought to an end. Smillie, in his signed article advising acceptance, which was published in the *Daily Herald*, expressed no dislike to the practice of making wages dependent on output—on the contrary, he gave it a tacit approval, thus:—

"... The 2s. a day increase will be conceded on and from the day work is resumed... to the end of the present year. Its continuance after that period will depend on the values received for export coal during the last two weeks of November and the first three weeks of December.

"If the necessary values are to be obtained, they will have to be secured from increased output, and in the agreement the mine-owners and the miners are pledged to co-operate and to do their very best to secure a higher output.

"If this co-operation can be ensured, there does not seem to be any reason why the output should not be secured, which will not only give the necessary 2s. per day, but will ensure value for further increases of wages."

Smillie says here that "the mine-owners and the miners are pledged to co-operate." We do not agree that the miners are pledged to co-operate with the mine-owners, but we know that the desire of the capitalists is to secure the co-operation of the workers in the production of profits, whilst the capitalists retain the power.

To make wages dependent on output, and to secure the co-operation of the workers and capitalists in increasing output, is an unmixed evil, from the Communist standpoint; Communists desire to end, not to mend, the Capitalist System. If wages are dependent on output, and co-operation between employer and employed to increase output is actually secured, the following objectionable results are liable to arise:—

(1) The workers' realisation of, and efforts in the class-struggle are reduced.

(2) The strike, which is an important weapon of class-warfare, is made more difficult and painful for the workers, because they not only suffer in loss of wages during the strike, but in reduction of wages afterwards, the strike having reduced the output on which their wages scale is based. Sectional strikes in one or more collieries or districts, may, by reducing the total output, reduce the wages for all the mine-workers.

(3) Under certain circumstances, it may pay the employers to keep down output and increase unemployment, because, as output increases, the rate of wages, and therefore the labour cost of production increases.

(4) Making wages dependent on output, tends to increase the pressure upon the workers to produce in haste. In a dangerous trade like mining, this presents a serious danger.

Smillie Says There will be No Slave-driving.

Robert Smillie, in his *Herald* article, attempts to rebut this latter argument. Thus:—

"Both sides are agreed that the workman who is at present doing a fair day's work shall not be expected to further strain himself to further increase output. This would be unthinkable, as such strain would injure the health and incur greater risk of accident to the miner.

"The worker may eliminate from his mind the fear which evidently exists in the minds of many

mine workers, that any attempt to increase output will probably result in additional slave-driving at the mines."

How is it that Mr. Smillie has now become so guileless and trustful towards the capitalists? Has he forgotten the evidence he gave before the Coal Commission? How can he take the responsibility of assuring the miners that there will be no slave-driving under Capitalism?

Hodges Abandons Nationalisation.

We Communists, of course, know that the Nationalisation of the mines, so long as the capitalist system exists, will not end the exploitation of the mine-workers. Therefore, we were without enthusiasm for the Miners' Federation's programme of Nationalisation.

Nevertheless, we do not think that the miners, whose official conferences have so frequently announced their determination to fight for Nationalisation, can allow to pass without protest, this utterance of their General Secretary, Frank Hodges, which appeared in his signed article in the *Daily Herald* of November 1st:—

"It is seen by the miners' representatives more clearly than ever that they are not having the benefits of nationalisation of mines nor the benefits of well-organised private ownership.

"As the former does not now seem to be within the realm of immediate practical politics, an attempt is to be made to make the latter of greater value to the workmen, owners and the nation generally."

Mr. Hodges says we cannot get Nationalisation, it is not within the realm of practical politics. Therefore let us make private ownership "of greater value to the workmen, owners, and the nation generally."

A more surprising piece of opportunism was surely never uttered by any politician, least of all, by one calling himself, as Hodges does, a Marxian!

Hodges says that if the principles embodied in the agreement were more than a temporary expedient, "he would advise the workmen to reject them in their entirety, whatever the cost."

Hodges knows that the Government's intention is to make all the objectionable features permanent, and that these features will remain as long as the workmen tolerate them. These features can only be destroyed by the workers refusing to work under them, and unless the features are to become permanent, the workers will have to fight in earnest sooner or later.

As Hodges points out, wages are likely to be reduced in January, if the present agreement is carried out.

But we do not believe that the miners will allow wages to be reduced in January. Whatever the conditions may be then, any attempt to reduce wages will result in a strike, of that, we are convinced.

A National Wages Board.

The *Herald* and some of the Trade Union leaders have made a great point of the possibility which, they contend, is afforded by this settlement, of setting up a National Wages Board; the *Daily Herald*, that apostle of law and order, insisted that the miners must swallow this settlement with a good grace and return dutifully to work, lest they jeopardise the possibility of the National Board.

The notion that a National Wages Board is a specific for securing better conditions for the workers, is one that has been exploded over and over again. It is extraordinary that any worker should ever have been gulled by it!

Workers, place no faith in Wages Boards or Conciliation Boards, whether National or local, get on with your fight to overthrow the capitalist system!

CRIMINALS BEHIND THE SCENES.

The Fruits of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.

By ARTHUR FINCH.

If ever a people's history be written, it will be found that the plotting and counter-plotting amongst the powers, which ended in a semi-decade of murder-madness in Europe and elsewhere, had its springs mainly in the rivalries of English, French, German, Japanese and Russian financiers, monopolists and diplomatists for the economic and political subservience of the Far East, of which China was, and is still, the principal victim.

The first act of the drama of exploitation, opened 80 years ago, when England forced war on China, to compel her to buy opium, to enrich the East Indian traders.

Incidentally, it paved the way for the entry of Lancashire's cotton goods. In the next scene, Russia appears, in the person of Count Muraviev, to force concessions on China, in 1858. His prize was the practical session of Mongolia for economic exploitation. In Scene III, France is the chief actor. She sought mischief in Far Eastern waters, marking down Annam and Tonquin as centres for trade expansion. The curtain falls, with the Chinese fleet destroyed and her diplomatists signing the Fournier Treaty of 1884, and French bluejackets hoisting the tricolour over Tonquin.

When the curtain rises again, Japan enters as a masterful actor. Steeped in the craft of diplomatic make-believe gained through intercourse with the Western Powers, she enters the lists against China, to free oppressed nationalities, new style. The victim was Korea. As generally happens on the stage, the brave knight wins the battle.

Scene II then opens with the victor presenting the bill for damages. It included the cession of Formosa and Liaotung Peninsula, China's recognition of "L'Independence" of Korea, payment of £35,000,000. But the other actors, French, German, and Russian, appear and dispute Japan's right to take the Liaotung Peninsula. "What!" they exclaim in chorus, "this means the dismemberment of China. And we have pledged ourselves to safeguard her territory. It cannot be."

Japan retreated, but pocketing an additional £6,000,000 from China.

Scene III opens two years later.

Enter the Wilhelmstrasse (German Foreign Office), demanding, with military menaces, Kiao-chau, Shantung Peninsula, on a fifty years' lease, as compensation for the murder of two missionaries. "Nicky," Wilhelm's cousin, became annoyed exceedingly; proceeds secretly to get all sorts of concessions out of Li Hung Chang; with the result that (after protesting against the Liaotung cession two years before), she sends a force of bluejackets to seize Port Arthur, Liaotung Peninsula. It ends with China signing the lease of Port Arthur to Russia; followed quickly by additional demands for exclusive rights in Manchuria; and on the part of England and France, leases being granted respectively, of Wei-hai-Wei and of Kuang-chau-wan.

Events move rapidly in the next Act, the ground having been prepared by Witte, Russia's Finance Minister, seeking money for the Chinese-Eastern railway scheme to link up with the Trans-Siberian railway, and approaching England, though then unsuccessfully, to finance it. It was then that England became nervous of Russia, of which fact the new Japanese Minister to London, Count Kayashi (See his "Secret Memoirs"), took advantage. Meanwhile, the united sacking of Peking provided a diversion, though involving poor China in an indemnity of £67,000,000. A year later, 1901, the second scene opens with Eckhardstein, German *chargé d'affaires* in London, proposing to Hayashi, a Triple Alliance between Japan, Great Britain, and Germany to circumvent Russia. Hayashi was then authorised to find out what the British Foreign Office thought about the proposal. In a discussion which followed with Lord Lansdowne, the latter favoured an Anglo-Japanese agreement, and the late King Edward the Peacemaker, fearing that Japan might ally herself with Rus-

sia, urged its desirability. Negotiations began, and ended with the signing of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance* on January 30th, 1902. This alliance, as England desired, stimulated the interplay of diplomatic and commercial rivalry on the part of Japan and Russia, brought to a head with the Yalu Forest concessions, and ended in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904, from which Japan emerged victorious, obtaining the Liaotung Peninsula, and, it is said, a secret arrangement regarding Manchuria. The summer of 1905 saw Korea annexed by Japan, on the pretext of disorders, which her agents had fomented, and the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance (signed on August 12th, 1905). By the latter, she got England, in Article III, to recognise her "paramount political, military and economic interests" in Korea, whilst both Powers had the audacity to re-affirm the "principle of equal opportunity for all nations," there! This full scene closes with the interesting Willy-Nicky correspondence, initiated by the Kaiser on the eve of the abortive Russian Revolution of that year, by means of French and British gold, and ended in a treaty signed on August 23rd, 1905, the purpose of which was to "abolish Anglo-Japanese arrogance and insolence." Through Witte, the treaty was later abandoned, however.

The last Act opens with the Triple Entente encircling policy of Germany, involving England and France in bolstering up Czarism, by loans, enabling the latter to pursue a policy of aggrandisement in Mongolia at China's expense. Meanwhile, Japan was pursuing a policy of colonisation and exploitation of Inner Mongolia and of Southern Manchuria, which was later to lead to her paramouncy there and the exclusion of the trade of other nationalities, affecting the United States in particular. England did not protest. Instead, she renewed the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, on July 13, 1911, which came up for renewal recently. The fall of the Manchu power, and then the coming of the European war, gave Japan "the opportunity of a thousand years," *vide* Count Okuma. In Scene II of the last Act, we find Japan seizing Kiao-chau, Shantung Province, but promising to return it to China for disposal at the close of the war. After the United States' suspicions had been aroused, she fortified it, then tried in 1917, to get Russia's consent to its acquisition, *vide* despatch of M. Krupensky, late Ambassador at Tokyo! The next Scene shows Japan, armed to the teeth, demanding by Ultimatum of May 7th, 1915, the acceptance of her infamous Twenty-one demands on China, of January 18th, 1915, every clause of which infringed China's sovereignty. The object was to give Japan economic control of Southern Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia; control of China's coal and iron resources, as well as military affairs. The first, she now has; the second has been obtained in return for loans entered into with bandits and factionists; and the third, the climax to the loan policy was, I believe, consummated in the secret agreement with Premier Tuan-chi-jui, on May 16th, 1918. Meanwhile the scene shifts, with the United States entering vigorous protests against Japanese machinations, though later by the Ishi agreement of November 2nd, 1917, recognising Japan's "special rights in China." Then the action is transferred to Russia.

The Secret Convention of July 3rd, 1916, having granted to Japan, in return for munitions

* Article 1, whilst recognising the independence of China and of Korea, at the same time admits their special interests in China, and Japan's being "interested in a peculiar degree politically, as well as commercially and industrially, in Korea." Article 2 provides for neutrality in the event of either becoming involved in war. Article 3, the most important reads in full: "If in the above event [war] any other power or powers should join in hostilities against that ally, the other high contracting party will come to its assistance, and will conduct war in common, and make peace in mutual agreement with it." In the Preamble of the Agreement of July 19th, 1911 (b), both powers solemnly agree to insure the independence and integrity of the Chinese Empire and the principle of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations in China!

supplied to Russia, the special rights hitherto possessed by the latter in Northern Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, and entry into Eastern Siberia, when the Czarist Government fell, she proceeded to dominate these parts, in fulfilment of the agreement. She still does so, and only as regards Siberia will she retire (according to a reported agreement just reached), if "the Soviet Government agrees to concede all Russian mining, railway and forestry concessions in Manchuria and Mongolia, either developed or undeveloped," with the right to build a railway linking up the Chinese-Eastern Railway, the latter under Japanese control. Thus her will to power will have been accomplished in the Far East, over the body of China. All would be well for the militarists of Japan, except that China's educated youth and merchants boycott her goods, and that an unnamed Power has been for some time past, and is at this moment, desiring to re-invest its surplus capital in China, for railway and canal and road-building enterprises. New economic rivalries often result in wars. If, therefore, in the future, trouble should arise in the Far East, it is the country that is free from Alliances that will be able to be at peace. Never again must this country be involved in Alliances of the nature of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. The French military understanding, which led the blindfolded workers of England into war, must not be forgotten! There is only one way; it is for Internationalists to denounce the Anglo-Japanese Alliance as strongly as they have denounced the illegal Russian war. That may bring peace in the Far East. There is certainly no other way.

MORE SECRET DIPLOMACY.

"Never again!" cried the Jingo. "This is the war to end war. With this war, ends secret diplomacy!"

These should be days of great awakening for the I.L.P. and Labour Party members, who followed as their guiding star, the Union of Democratic Control, and who substituted for their original object, Socialism, those will o' the wisp, the League of Nations, which was to end all sectional alliances and agreements, and open diplomacy, which cannot exist within the capitalist system.

The Franco-Belgian Agreement has progressed another stage, and it is now publicly stated that the Note announcing the Agreement, which has been addressed to the League of Nations, "does not disclose the technical part of the agreement, which remains the secret of the General Staffs concerned."

THE M.U.C.

Comrade Malone, M.P., in a letter to the Editor, draws attention to the Middle Classes Union (inaugurated March, 1919), and "perhaps," he adds, "the 'Workers' Dreadnought' readers would be well advised to keep their eyes on the organisers and members of this Middle Classes Union in the coming weeks."

In an official leaflet issued by this Union occurs the following:—

What It Can Do.

1. It can stem the flow of Bolshevism in this country.
2. It can prevent the disaster of Nationalisation.
3. It can counteract the destructive effect of national or sectional strikes far more effectively than by the use either of military or police.
4. It can strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with either the demands or threats of extreme labour. . . . Etc., etc.

What the Union Has Done.

In a little over a year since its inception the Union has, through its branches and members,

(a) Provided several thousand volunteers during the railway strike in October, 1919.

(b) Maintained the supply of gas during the "unofficial" strike in North Middlesex in February, 1920, pending the obtaining of sufficient "free labour."

(c) Prevented a large increase in the rates in an urban district upon an unwanted free library, by a referendum to the ratepayers.

(d) Prevented a strike of omnibus conductors by undertaking to defend the interests of the general public.

(e) Provided some five to six hundred volunteers to maintain essential services during a strike in Southampton in May, 1920.

(f) Undertaken to supply one hundred qualified engineers as volunteers to maintain the electricity supply in Sheffield, and thus averted a threatened strike. . . . Etc., etc.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

RUSSIA.

Importation of Medicine.

Moscow, October 5th.

The surgeons and sick of Soviet Russia suffer horribly from the need of medicine, which before, were imported from abroad. The barbarous blockade stopped all imports. At the present time, this blockade seems to be broken, so far as medicine is concerned. Already eight railway-truck-loads of medicine have arrived from England and six from Germany. Krassin, while in England, bought great quantities of medicine and surgical instruments which are imported to Russia via Reval. The English Quakers sent us five truck-loads of drugs. From our American friends, we expect, very shortly, two shiploads of medicine.

Communist Saturdays.

The last "Communist Saturday" was a great success. Instead of the 82,000 partisans expected, 60,000 arrived, voluntarily, at the Moscow Railway Station, to unload railway-trucks.

Counter Revolutionary Lies.

Moscow, October, 23rd.

The rumours about Budenny's treachery, are defamatory. Budenny is still the same revolutionary hero, the same valiant soldier as before. That he conducted a deputation of the Red Army, which asked for peace, is also a pure lie.

Nauen wired on October 12th, that Ukrainian insurgents took Kieff. This report is an invention. Also the reports that an Anti-Russian wave prevails in the Ukraine. The Ukrainian working-class is as solid as ever in their unity with Soviet Russia.

Anniversary of the Revolution.

Berlin, October 25th.

Throughout Russia, into its farthest villages, preparations are being made for the fête of the anniversary of the Revolution. Great meetings are arranged. A jubilee pamphlet about the October Revolution will be issued. The Government will also proclaim a large political amnesty.

England and Wrangel.

Moscow, October 24th.

Kameneff visited the Wrangel front of the Red Army. He assured the troops that the Red flag will soon be flying over Sevastopol, the capital of Wrangel.

An explosion in Sevastopol destroyed immense stocks of English munitions and several millions of rifles, which arrived in the Crimea on the ship "Nowgordod," sailing under the British flag.

Trade Between Russia and Italy.

The trade relations between Italy and Russia are fully alive. Every week, big ships of the Trieste-Lloyd arrive at Batum, with loads of thousands of tons which have been bought by the Soviet Government.

Regular Train Services in Russia.

The passenger train services are slowly arriving at their normal standard. At the present time, it takes 24 hours to go from Moscow to Charkow, from Moscow to Archangel 50 hours, from Moscow to Omsk 119 hours, from Moscow to Saratov 28 hours, and from Moscow to Petrograd in 15 hours.

Poor Lenin—Again.

Copenhagen, October 28th.

Berlingske Tidende reports from Kowno:—

The Russian paper Echo reports from an impartial source, that within the next few days, events of the greatest political importance will take place in Petrograd and Moscow. The downfall of Lenin's regime is expected.

ITALY.

A Reactionary "Putsch"?

Milan, October 24th.

There is a rumour that on the anniversary of the siege of Vittorio Veneto, a nationalist-militarist rising will take place.

Reaction.

Rome, October 25th.

A Cabinet meeting decided to punish severely, all any persons demonstrating in connection with Malatesta's arrest.

Mass Arrests.

Milan, October 26th.

New mass arrests were made in Genoa, where Anarchists held a protest meeting against the arrest of Malatesta. In Padua, the police arrested 15 Anarchists.

"Umanita Nuova."

Milan, October 27th.

The offices of Umanita Nuova have been raided. All manuscripts and books, as well as the commercial ledgers, have been confiscated. The editors were arrested. The paper states that it will be published just the same as before, even if its editors are in prison and their books with the police.

FRANCE.

Unemployment.

Paris, October 22nd.

Large industries are beginning to close down. Thousands of workers throughout France are being sent home. In the Seine Department, 40 per cent. of the workers employed in the motor-car industry have been discharged. 50 per cent. of the workers in the tweed industry, and 75 per cent. in the leather industry are also unemployed.

A Council of Action, Too.

Paris, October 22nd.

In the Bataille, Demoullins writes that the Conferences between the Socialist Party and C.G.T. will finish with the creation of a Council of Action.

GERMANY.

Honour to the Proletarian Heroes.

Berlin, October 25th.

Comrades Zinoviev and Losovsky have again shown their sympathy with the German proletariat, when they put wreaths on the graves of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, with the following inscriptions:

"To the fallen fighters of the German Revolution."—From the Executive of the Communist International.

"To the Heroes of the German and International Communisms, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht."—From the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Russia.

"In the names Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, lie the rays of hope for the International working class."—From the Executive of the Communist International.

"To what Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht taught us, we shall be faithful to the last drop of our blood."—From the Petrograd Workers and the Red Army Council.

Creation of a United German Communist Party.

Berlin, October 26th.

In the Rote Fahne, the Central Committee of the U.S.P. Left Wing, publishes an appeal to the revolutionary working-class of Germany, signed by Daeumig, Hoffman, Kochnen and Zinoviev, in which the creation of a United Party of the Communists is claimed.

Slackness of Business.

Berlin, October 27th.

During the last month, 50,000 persons seceded from the National Protestant Church.

SPAIN.

Reaction.

Saragossa, October 22nd.

The police arrested the leaders of the Communist Group.

ROUMANIA.

General Strike.

Bucharest, October 21st.

To-day a general strike has been declared. The Communist leaders, Dragu and Tanase have been arrested.

SOUTH AMERICA.

Revolution in Venezuela.

Buenos Aires, Oct. 21st.

A revolution has started in Venezuela.

A DEBATE. By NESS EDWARDS.

Rate of Profit, Marx, and a Critic.

Were it not for the fact that the "Dreadnought" has a wide circulation among scientific Socialist students in this and other countries, I would have preferred to allow the criticism of the tendency of the average rate of profit to fall, referred to in a broad way in the contribution under my name in your last issue, to go unanswered. That one of the basic tendencies of Socialism, upon which Marx laid so much emphasis, should be brushed aside by a leading Socialist paper, is certainly astonishing.

Whilst referring the student to "Capital," vol. III, chapter 13, and to a more popular account in Boudine's "Theoretical System of Marx," pages 187-189, perhaps it would be well if an attempt is made just to outline the fallacy of the objections made in last week's issue. This again is fraught with difficulties, as the terminology of advanced economics has to be exact, and generally itself requires explaining. Anyhow, I will try to. Let me take my critic's first point:—

"The introduction of machinery, besides being the inevitable result of the advancement of positive science, is due to the desire to both increase profits and to make them more quickly—in short, a more rapid accumulation of capital."

This may sound all right on the surface, but are not capitalists compelled by competition either to use the up-to-date machinery or to fall out of the scramble for profits and become bankrupt? Competition itself compels the capitalist to produce more and more cheaply, and this can only be done, in the main, through the application of machinery. Then to reproduce the value already invested by him, he has to adopt these new methods or lose it. Machinery is labour saving, and to the extent that it is applied, labour power is dispensed with. And if labour-power is the source of all value, as Marx says, does not that mean that relatively less value-creating (profit-creating) material is used per \$100 of capital? And therefore, because the rate of exploitation has physical limits, and the limit of the application of machinery have not yet been attained, the rate of profit must fall. (We are much afraid that the desire of the capitalist to tie up his capital

in non-value-creating material, fixed capital (machines, raw materials, etc.), is really economic necessity in disguise. The following sentence, "The rate of profit is higher and fortunes are more rapidly made in Birmingham and Manchester than in other counties, where production is still in the pre-industrial stage," is quite an unpardonable error. Here, where we are discussing the rate of profit, the rate is confused with the mass of profit, and in order to disprove a law of capitalist society, comparison is made with feudal society.

Assume that a small master, in later feudal days, employs 10 men to make hats, and that he pays each one shilling per day. Also that his raw materials, etc., cost him 90s., and that the rate of exploitation is 100 per cent. We will find his profit 10 per cent. Suppose now that a capitalist of to-day has a capital of 100s., 98s. of which he pays for raw material, machinery, etc., and that he employs two men, whom he pays 1s. each. Assume also that the rate of exploitation (surplus value) is again 100 per cent., then we find that his profit is only 2 per cent.

My critic will immediately object to the rate of exploitation being the same, and will protest that the worker has to work much harder these days. Quite right, I answer, so let us double the rate of rate of exploitation and say it is 200 per cent. Even then the rate of profit is only 4 per cent. Indeed, the rate of exploitation of labour would have to be increased five times before the rate of profit would equal the old rate.

Whilst these examples are extreme, they are certainly true, and mirror in magnified fashion both my critic's mistake and capitalist tendencies. The point re closing the market, my critic says, does not prove the case; in fact, he suggests the opposite. Speaking of the Lancashire cotton manufacturers, he says that higher profits are made in India, because they employ cheap native labour. But is capitalist production the normal form of production in India, and again, is he going to disprove a law of capitalist production by a phenomenon in a semi-feudal society? Is it not an accepted fact that the "devil of trades unionism" is a nor-

mal factor in capitalism, which tends to make for dearer labour-power.

But even in an undeveloped country like India, the relatively high rate of profit attracted more and more capital, and thus destroys the cheap labour, causes Trades Unions to arise, which, by "their consciousness and capacity for organisation" will, in the long run, force wages above the subsistence level. A capitalist, working with improved methods (or better facilities) of production, that have not yet become general, sells below the market price, yet above his individual cost of production. In this way his profit rises until competition levels it down." (Marx.)

The reader may now wonder why all this fuss about such points as these, and, in a few words, we shall try and point out their import to scientific Socialism.

The tendency of the rate of profit to fall is a result, in the first place, of competition. It causes a progressive application of labour-saving machinery, which leads to the creation of an unemployed army. Competition between capitalists compels still further use of labour-saving machinery, and still further enlarges the army of unemployed. This application of machinery leads to the concentration of huge masses of means of production into the hands of a few people. We then get social labour and production controlled by a few capitalists. This militates against social well-being, and we demand that social production shall be socially controlled. "The works to the workers; down with the capitalists," becomes our cry, and the great unemployed army re-echoes our cry and assumes a more menacing attitude as we become more conscious of the social forces of capitalist society, and of economic laws and tendencies, our tactics tend more and more to conform to them, and thus the mechanical laws of economics find their social expression in the revolutionary Socialist movement.

In conclusion, we say that an attempt has been made to answer our critic; if we have failed, we can only refer our critic and also the readers to the aforementioned work of the founder of Socialism.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

Published by the Communist Party.
(British Section of the Third International).
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.
Acting Editor: JACK O'SULLIVAN.

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

TELEPHONE: EAST 1787.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY DOES NOT HOLD
ITSELF RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY OPINIONS AP-
PEARING OVER INDIVIDUAL SIGNATURES.

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

SUBSCRIPTION:

THREE MONTHS (13 weeks) ...	Post Free 2/9
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ...	" " 5/5
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ...	" " 10/10

Vol. VII. No. 34. Saturday, November 18, 1920.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.

The Lord Mayor of Cork died the slow, lingering death of starvation, and the Irish people watched and waited, raising no hand to save him. Other hunger-strikers have gone or are going to their graves by the same path of agony. Young Kevin Barry has been hanged in Mountjoy prison, in Dublin, surrounded by the Irish people, who took no step to save him. The Irish people are supposed to be seething with Nationalist fervour and determination to secure and maintain a free and independent Republic for Ireland. The Irish Labour Movement is supposed to be filled with a resolute militant spirit which is eagerly at the service of the Nationalist cause.

Why then, did the Irish people do nothing, why are they doing nothing to save the lives of their martyrs? What could they do? What could the Irish Labour Movement do?

They might have proclaimed a general strike to save the lives of MacSwiney and the other Irish hunger-strikers, and to prevent the hanging of Kevin Barry.

The general strike might be used to advance the Nationalist cause.

Why has the general strike been used so little in Ireland? How far would it aid in the struggle against the Government at this juncture?

A demonstration one-day general strike was successfully used to prevent the application of conscription in Ireland. That success might have been expected to encourage Sinn Fein to use the strike weapon on other important occasions.

When an attempt was made to impose military permits upon the people of Limerick, the workers declared a general strike, but strange to say, the Sinn Fein organisation gave them no support. 30,000 workers were made penniless by the strike. There was no wealthy Trade Union to come to their aid, for though many of the workers belonged to the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union, having been many times broken down, it is exceedingly poor. Monetary assistance was of immediate urgency. Three weeks elapsed, but the Sinn Fein organisation subscribed nothing.

It must be remembered that Arthur Griffith, the political head of the Sinn Fein organisation, has always been a bitter opponent of the working-class movement. In the great Dublin lock-out of 1912, he was against the workers.

It is strange that throughout Ireland's bitter struggle for Independence, the mass of the people have dumbly obeyed the British overlordship. It is extraordinary, that only in recent months have we had a strike of Irish railwaymen and transport workers, against carrying the British military. And now we find that it is not the workers but the railway companies, acting in conjunction with the Government, that resort in this struggle to the expedient of holding up transport, and it is the military who hold up production at this point, and that, in the midst of the struggle.

From India, we have long heard of the partially applied boycott of British goods as a weapon in the Nationalist struggle. It is strange that the Irish have not endeavoured to establish a complete boycott of British goods, and a complete refusal to handle goods for export from Ireland to Britain.

The news that the British Government, by closing down the railways, will leave big tracts of

and markets are being prohibited, and postal and telegraph services are being suspended, shows that the Government has decided to employ, as far as it suits it to do so, the weapon of suspending production, which the Irish workers have left unused. In Ireland, the military, it seems, have even gone so far as to close all bakeries but one, and to prevent the population from using that one.

The population must assuredly retaliate sooner or later, and the forces of the British Government, absolutely boycotted by the Irish people, will presently be obliged to depend upon their own energies for all the services they require. The British military and police will be compelled to find within their own ranks, the hands that will prepare and transport all they need.

The warfare that is in progress in Ireland, is bringing into the Nationalist struggle to-day, not merely the enthusiastic minority, but the great mass of the population—virtually every man, every woman and child is forced to become an active participant. At Balinlee, for instance, the civilian population turned out to defend their village, and actually put to flight the uniformed forces of the British Government.

All this is preparing the Irish workers for the class-war, which must undoubtedly arise in an acute form as soon as the Nationalist struggle has been allayed by success.

Meanwhile, the British workmen are manning the Army that fights in Ireland, and to an increasing extent will replace the Irish transport workers, railwaymen and others who will refuse to perform, or be dismissed from performing all sorts of industrial services required by the British forces in Ireland.

The Irish workers have scarcely begun to exhibit solidarity as producers in the struggle against the British Government. The tactics of the Government are removing all the scruples which ordinarily deter the workers from the use of industrial mass-action. Presently we shall see the Irish workers using it as far as it is possible to use it. Then we shall be able to observe how far mass-action is a match for militarist coercion in the hands of the *de facto* Government.

British industrial direct actionists should follow the example of the Labour Party, and send a deputation over to Ireland, but with a different motive.

F. O'BRIEN.

HENDERSON ON THE COALITION FAILURE.

Arthur Henderson, in the "Daily Herald" of November 6th, writes what the "Herald" calls Labour's indictment of the Coalition. But why Labour's indictment?

There is nothing in Henderson's article that an orthodox bourgeois member of the Liberal Party might not have written; there is no least mention, or even hint, of the class war.

Indeed, Mr. Henderson does not seem to know that the class war exists; he appears quite ignorant of the fact that it dominates the entire national and international field of politics. He says to the Government:—

"On the four chief issues of the moment, namely, peace and foreign affairs, national finance, Labour and Ireland, it has proceeded from one blunder to another."

He seems to assume that these are all quite detached questions, and he does not even make what he calls "Labour questions" the main issue; he sandwiches them in the midst of the series—even treating the Irish question as more important than the universal class struggle—a strange and faithless position this for the leader of the Labour Party to take up!

In his criticism of the Government's financial policy he is quite the Liberal. He demands direct taxation and reduction of the national debt like any Asquithian.

"Conditions throughout the greater part of Europe were never more dangerous or unsettled than they are to-day," writes Henderson. Dangerous towards what? Towards the established capitalist system, it appears!

In referring to "peace and foreign affairs," Henderson ignores the working-class standpoint altogether. He does not pretend to understand even that the capitalist war on Soviet Russia is a "Labour question." How much more frank and intelligent than this superficial article of Henderson's was Winston Churchill's recent admission that he judges world events and world tendencies from the point of view of whether they are Bolshevik or anti-Bolshevik.

Of course he does, and so do we, in company with all well-informed persons. Henderson, who absolutely refuses to be Bolshevik, is therefore anti-Bolshevik, and an upholder of the capitalist system.

But what does this Henderson indictment say of the Government's policy on "Labour questions"? This:—

"It has shown little anxiety to give legal effect to the unanimous recommendations of the National Joint Industrial Conference representing Trade

Unions and employers, which was called together last year by the Government itself."

So there we have it: the policy that Mr. Henderson reproached the Government for not having adopted is that of co-operation between capital and Labour, and complete acceptance of the capitalist system of employers and employed as a permanent institution!

No one need be surprised, however, at the feebleness of Mr. Henderson's so-called indictment of the capitalist Coalition Government, for in making it he still supports the title of Right Hon. which the Coalition conferred on him. Thereby he recalls and publishes, as something of which he still remains proud, the fact that he was not long ago a member of the capitalist Coalition Government. Meanwhile the "Right Hon. Arthur Henderson," ex-Coalition Minister, is supposed to be the leader of the Labour Party. Comrades, what a fraud this is! When will organised Labour realise it?

In a second "Herald" article, Arthur Henderson gives what he calls "Labour's alternative" to the Coalition policy. This includes peace and trade with Soviet Russia, revision of the Versailles Peace Treaty, abdication of the Allied Supreme Council, increased power to the League of Nations, a Constituent Assembly to draft a constitution for Ireland, nationalisation and workers' control of industry, and a graduated levy on wealth to reduce the National debt.

What is good in this programme can never be carried out within the capitalist system.

To demand nationalisation and workers' control of industry, side by side with a graduated levy on private fortunes, is an absurdity, for genuine nationalisation and workers' control of industry entail Socialism, and, if we had that, fortunes would naturally be wiped out of existence.

As to the League of Nations, in which Henderson wishes Labour to place its faith, and to which he wishes to refer the question of Irish guarantees, this is and must be the instrument of international capitalism, so long as capitalism is in control in the nations which form the League. So long as the Allies are the dominant factor in the League of Nations, it is obvious that the League of Nations will differ not at all in its actions from the Allied Supreme Council, which Henderson desires to dissolve.

The Irish Republicans can tell Mr. Henderson the story of their mistaken faith that the League of Nations would secure self-determination for Ireland, and of the blank denial which Ireland received from the League. Of course it was inevitable that Ireland should receive a blank denial. Was she not appealing for self-determination to the British Government and its Allies?

In very truth Henderson's policy for Labour is a futile and ineffective—even an impossible one. The workers who follow him will merely be led down a blind alley.

ROBERT WILLIAMS AGAIN CRIES "IF."

It is very nice to know that there has been a crowded and enthusiastic meeting in the Albert Hall to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution, but the resolution moved by Robert Williams was one much more suited to the temperament of Robert Williams than to the Communist Party.

This resolution called on the National Council of Action to send an ultimatum to the Government threatening that unless the British Government completely raised the blockade, abstained from all interference in Russian affairs, established full trading relations, and recognised the Russian Soviet Government by a specific date, then the National Council of Action should be instructed to call a national down tools policy.

To pass such a resolution is to push an open door. The Council of Action will obey the instruction with alacrity; it is like Robert Williams himself, always pleased to obey anyone's instructions, to threaten the Government with a down tools policy. Even Trades Union and Labour Party conferences have done that. It has become quite respectable and orthodox; indeed, it is the fashion nowadays to threaten the Government with a down tools policy.

But to carry out the threat is another matter—those who drafted the resolution appear to have forgotten that!

WRANGEL'S DEFEAT.

So another Czarist general is finally defeated and the Russian Workers' Republic scores a new triumph. During the last two months the Press has been full of stories of disaster, mutiny, starvation and defeat for Soviet Russia, and it was even reported that the Soviet Government, supposedly hastening to a swift end, had signed peace with Wrangel.

And now exit Wrangel; even the French Foreign Office has thrown him over. Martel, the new French Commissioner in South Russia, is now said to have opened relations with Pischoff, a leader of the Social-Revolutionaries, capitalism at last finding that open reactionaries like Denikin and Wrangel have no chance at all in Russia, are now turning to the Social-Revolutionaries in the hope that their democratic phraseology may make reaction more acceptable to the Russian people. The ruse will of course fail; the Russian people have learnt the economic lesson too well; have been too thoroughly taught, and have bought their experience too dearly for any danger of their again falling under the spell of such political charlatana.

Pischoff, the Social-Revolutionary now negotiating with the French Foreign Office, is said to be the son of Maxim Gorky, and yet Gorky is regarded as a reliable and impartial witness, when he occasionally denounces, occasionally eulogises the Soviet Government.

THE I.L.P. ERUPTION. By An I.L.P.er.

What a fluttering there is in the I.L.P. dovetails! Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Snowden, the high priests of the Party, at variance with the majority report of the Policy Committee, and Mr. Macdonald, actually the chairman of the Party, refusing to sign it! Indeed, Comrades, you who are not in the I.L.P. do not realise how important and exciting this upheaval is!

The formation of the Policy Committee in itself was a most important event. Here were we of the I.L.P. determined to teach the Russian Soviet Republic and all the Socialist Parties of Europe how Socialism should be won, and what Socialism is. We were preparing to draft the constitution of the model Socialist State. All this was to be done in accordance with the "I.L.P. spirit," which is something quite unique, and altogether superior to that of any Socialist Party in any country. Indeed, we of the I.L.P. are rightly convinced that we are the leaders of the International.

Twenty Intellectuals.

Our Policy Committee of twenty persons left nothing to be desired. It had all the leading Labour-Socialist intellectuals of London upon it. The sub-committee of five, which the main committee appointed to draw up the recommendations, was in itself a remarkable collection of intellectuals, including, as it did, J. R. Macdonald as chairman, and Clifford Allen, Fred Bramley, G. D. H. Cole, Frank Hodges, F. W. Jowett, B. N. Langdon-Davies, C. H. Norman, L. S. Woolf, and Enile Burns as secretary. Margaret Bondfield, H. N. Brailsford, and Tom Myers, M.P., were distinguished members of the Policy Committee.

Certainly it was a varied assortment of well-known people. We of the I.L.P. could congratulate ourselves on getting together a more varied assortment of well-known people than any other Socialist society could possibly have secured. Some intolerant critics ridiculed the idea that Brailsford, who is a Liberal, Norman, who is an individualist, Woolf, who is a Fabian and expert professional secretary, Cole, who is a Fabian National Guildsman, and others for various reasons, should create a policy for the Socialist movement, but most of us in the I.L.P. were quite satisfied at having secured such an influential committee. No one will be surprised that some of the most prominent stars were unable to attend the committees, but since we had had the use of their names to give the Policy Committee a send-off, we must not be disappointed that such well-known people as Tom Myers, M.P., Frank Hodges, of the Miners' Federation, H. N. Brailsford and Margaret Bondfield, who is the only woman on the Executive Committee of the Trades Union Congress, and who represented the Labour Party in America, should be unable to do more. These important people are supposed to have refused to sign the Manifesto because they could not attend the committees, but we do not think that it was ever even hoped they would attend. We feel sure that they have not signed, because, unfortunately, it is evident that the majority report of the Policy Committee will not command really general assent amongst those who support the many movements with which the stars, who were kind enough to lend their names to the Policy Committee, are associated. Of course, you must understand that such prominent people as those who have refrained from signing the report, could not possibly sign anything unless it were certain to command general assent.

What "The Times" Says.

Though the report does not command a sufficiently wide general assent to be signed by the stars of the Labour movement, the "Times" is right in its statement that it is not expected to cause any falling away in the I.L.P. membership. The Policy Committee has been too assiduous in its efforts to combine opposing points of view to create anything so definite as a split. Nevertheless, Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Snowden have thought it right to protect their reputations by protesting in the "Times" against certain tendencies that have crept in. Of course it is highly important that they should not be compromised in any way.

But let me turn to the report. Like the "Daily Herald" correspondent, I have prefaced my remarks by explaining to you what very influential people have had a part in it.

What the Report Says.

Clause 1 tells us that the I.L.P. is a Socialist organisation, and I for one am proud that the Policy Committee has taken that courageous stand. It is well that our colleagues of the Labour Party and the U.D.C. should have no doubt about our position.

Clause 2 is also very courageous; indeed, it is rather daring. It boldly takes its stand with the National Guilds' League. Of course, Mr. G. D. H. Cole is responsible for that, and we have to recognise that the work he has done in popularising the idea of workers' control of industry has been largely responsible for making it possible for any I.L.P. committee to commit itself to so definite a step. Before Mr. Cole got to work with the National Guilds' League, and even succeeded to get some large employers of labour to take an interest in the "Guild Idea," it was only irresponsible people like the South Wales miners and some syndico-anarchists who advocated that sort of thing. But Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Snowden still think it unwise for the I.L.P. to commit itself to any tendency towards workers' control of industry. They

recognise how much opposition the Russians have aroused against themselves on account of their efforts to put workers' control into practice. Of course, Mr. Cole tempers all his suggestions for workers' control by making it quite clear that the administrators and technicians are to have a large share of control, and that the consumers are to be represented. Clause 2 lays down that a central body and local bodies representing the people, both as consumers and producers, must determine the amount and character of communal production and service, the division of the national income and the co-ordination of supply and demand.

Clause 3 makes it clear that the I.L.P. Policy Committee does not abandon the democratic principle. It says:—

"The source of civic expression must be the whole body of citizens exercising authority through a national representative assembly, directly elected by the people with a decentralised system of local government."

The last phrase is particularly good, and will please many people. The Committee is to be congratulated upon it, I am sure, although I do not know what it means.

Clause 4 dictates:—

"For the purpose of co-ordinating the activities of the National Representative Assembly, and the organisation of producers and consumers, there must be a general council consisting in equal parts of representatives appointed by the National Assembly and the central body of organised producers and consumers."

Mr. Cole was for a long time very doubtful whether there should be a co-ordinating authority, and actually as to what body, if any, should hold the balance of power between his proposed Guild Council and National Parliament. The I.L.P. Policy Committee, which might have been as puzzled as he was about it, has had the benefit of his long thought, and so it has decided for a co-ordinating authority, composed of an equal number of representatives from both bodies. The special advantage is that Parliamentarians and industrialists have both something to satisfy them.

Of course we all know that this scheme is really that of Mr. Cole. Our I.L.P. speakers on the Policy Committee are very popular on the platform, but they never could think out a complicated scheme or take a new step without someone's help, and Mr. Cole has been able to point to Russia and show that the Soviet Republic has gone ever so much further than he wants to go, so that one need not be afraid of going as far as he goes. Of course, the compromise proposed by Mr. Cole is too risky an experiment to be countenanced by Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Snowden, but they will continue to act as ballast to the Party, so no one need hesitate about joining it.

Clause 6 deals with immediate objects. Its first two paragraphs are quite safe, and one ought to be careful where anything immediate is concerned. These paragraphs insist that we of the I.L.P. should go on with our work in the Trades Unions and Co-operative Societies. Everyone will agree to that.

Too Dangerous For Mr. Snowden.

Paragraph c, clause 6, however, is not so generally acceptable. Indeed, it is precisely the passage that Mr. Snowden thinks most dangerous. It says that we must set ourselves to:—

"The capture of local administrative bodies, with a view to the development of administration on Socialist lines and the destruction of the machinery of the capitalist state."

Mr. Snowden says:—

"I do not know how the phrase 'the destruction of the machinery of the capitalist state' comes to be incorporated in the draft because it was opposed by the majority. Personally, I am altogether opposed to it. It would certainly be used by those who are altogether opposed to democratic government. To advocate dictatorship of the proletariat is conceding their policy of getting into Parliament by disingenuous political methods in order to sabotage Parliament."

Mr. Snowden has here come to grips with those who advocated dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary methods. Mr. Macdonald had several times warned the Party against such doctrines, and has urged the branches through the columns of the "Labour Leader" not to allow such speakers on their platforms. Nevertheless, such people are gaining considerable influence in the I.L.P. and Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Snowden do not approve of it. The Policy Committee has tried to evade the issue and to smooth everything over, so that we can all keep together whatever our opinions may be, but Mr. Snowden wants to have the matter settled, once for all.

Of course, I quite understand his position. He is fitted to play a great diplomatic part in Parliament and to gain the support of both Liberal and Labour benches and of all true reformists in the constituencies. Naturally he disapproves of anything that savours of revolution. We of the I.L.P. understand what an acquisition to our Party such a statesman is, and we shall be careful not to jeopardise his position.

"International."

Clause 7 is entitled "International." It is typi-

cal of the I.L.P. spirit. I will give the clause in full:—

"Realising that imperialism and war waged by capitalist Governments constitute the greatest hindrances to the attainment of Socialism, the I.L.P. believes that it is incumbent upon Socialists to destroy imperialism and render war impossible; it therefore aims at the fullest development of the international working-class movement at the most effective action by that movement for the prevention of war and the liberation of subject peoples, and at aiding, by every means in its power, the victory of the working class in all lands."

Someone has unkindly laughed at that clause, which is so typical of "the I.L.P. spirit." He says it is ridiculous to say the I.L.P. believes it is "incumbent upon Socialists to destroy imperialism and render war impossible," as though we could do these things at will. But, of course, the clause means that it is incumbent on us to try and that is very important, because you know that most of our Labour Party colleagues still believe in imperialism, and it is really very courageous of the I.L.P. to come out and say that it is against imperialism. Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Snowden, when they are back at Westminster, which all the I.L.P.-ers hope will be soon, will find it very difficult to explain away any word which might seem to reflect upon the importance of maintaining the Empire, and if this phrase of the Policy Committee is adopted by the Party, all our I.L.P. Members of Parliament will find it very embarrassing. In fact, I predict that it may lead to some influential resignations from the Party, and, of course, we should all regret that; we are very proud of our I.L.P. Members of Parliament.

The person I know who laughed at the phrase about it being "incumbent upon Socialists" to destroy imperialism and render war impossible, because, as the clause says, they are "the greatest hindrances to the attainment of Socialism," says, that we in the I.L.P. do not understand either Capitalism or Socialism. He says it is absurd to talk about destroying imperialism as though it were a detached thing. He says that imperialism is an essential feature of modern capitalism, and that one cannot destroy it without destroying the capitalist system itself. He declares that this can only be achieved in the course of a tremendous struggle between Capital and Labour which will amount to international civil war. But we of the I.L.P. are pacifists, and we will not surrender one particle of our faith in human brotherhood.

Clause 8 is as follows:—

"In pursuance of these objects, the I.L.P. realises that owing to the fact that elections under the existing British Parliamentary system frequently result in false and inadequate representation, and enables governments to manipulate and thwart the national will, it may be necessary on specific occasions for the organised workers to use extra-political means such as direct action. The I.L.P., holding that the best means of effecting a peaceful revolution is for the organised workers to prepare themselves to take over the industrial machine, determined to take its part in the struggle of the working class to win its freedom from the economic tyranny imposed by the capitalist class and the capitalist State."

Of course we must all admit that that phrase is a compromise, meant for keeping the Party together. But Mr. Macdonald does not like it, and this is what he said about it in the "Times":—

"What I do not like about it is that it is too dogmatic in detail, and is not quite as firm as I should like it to be on political methods. I do not think it emphasises definitely enough, for instance, that no State can last unless it is supported by public opinion, and there is a little too much of a suggestion that a working class which does not trouble to educate itself politically can be saved by a small minority using force. I do not think the document quite interprets the real spirit of the Party."

We must admit however, that the Policy Committee has had a very difficult task, and that it has tried hard to please everybody. This clause has certain advantages. Mr. Macdonald, of course, thinks it concedes too much to those who do not respect the constitution, but it only says: "It may be necessary on specific occasions for the organised workers to use extra political means." That sets the I.L.P. free to support such resolutions for such objects as the general strike, against intervention in Soviet Russia and other wars. Nothing is likely to come of such resolutions, of course, and the I.L.P. would lose its influence with advanced Trades Unionists, if it were to refuse to support them now that "Direct Action" and Soviet Russia are so popular. The I.L.P. Members of Parliament will certainly find it difficult to explain away difficult matters. The Policy Committee has had to do the best it can under very difficult circumstances, and, as you will notice, the clause makes it clear that what we in the I.L.P. are out for is a peaceful revolution. The "Daily Herald" congratulates the Policy Committee on its "wisdom and skill," and expresses its satisfaction that the committee has said that the revolution must be peaceful.

A Rough Draft of the Thesis on the Agrarian Question.

For the Second Congress of the Communist International.

Comrade Marklevsky, in his article, has made a detailed statement concerning the reasons why the Second International—now the Yellow International—was unable, not only to define the tactics of the revolutionary proletariat in regard to the agrarian questions, but had even failed to deal with the question in a proper manner. Comrade Marklevsky then gave a theoretical basis of the Communist agrarian programme of the Third International.

The resolution on this question which will be drawn up at the forthcoming Congress of the Communist International, on the 15th to the 17th of November, 1920, can be made, and in my opinion, should be made on this basis.

The following is a rough draft of this resolution:—

1. Only the urban and industrial proletariat, as led by the Communist Party, is able to liberate the toiling masses of the rural districts, from the yoke of capital and large ownership, from disorganisation and capitalist wars which are inevitable under the capitalist system. There is no salvation for the toiling masses except in a union with the Communist proletariat and in a selfless revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of landlord and bourgeois oppression.

On the one hand, the industrial workers are unable to fulfil their historical mission of liberating these workers from capitalist oppression and war, if they limit themselves into narrow Trade Union interests at times, to the improvement of what may be called their middle-class position. This happens very often in many advanced countries to the "labour aristocracy," which is supposed to represent the fundamental basis of the Socialist parties of the Second International, but which really are the deadly enemies of Socialism, traitors to the Labour cause, and agents of the bourgeoisie working in the Labour movement. The proletariat is a really revolutionary and active Socialist class, only under conditions when it acts as the advance-guard of all workers and exploited; when it acts as the leader in the struggle for the overthrow of the exploiters; this it can be, only upon the introduction of the class-struggle into the agrarian districts, upon the unity of these toiling masses of the rural districts with the Communist Party of the urban proletariat and upon the education of the former by the latter.

2. The toiling and exploited masses of the rural districts who are to carry on a struggle, or at all events, to draw to their side the urban proletariat, are in all capitalist countries confronted by the following classes:

First, the agricultural proletariat, wage workers, on either annual, periodical or daily terms, who are making their living by working in capitalist agricultural enterprises. An independent individual group of the agricultural population, an organisation of this class in a political, military, professional, co-operative and educational sense, is a strong propaganda, and its attraction to the side of the Soviet Government and the dictatorship of the proletariat—these are principal tasks of the Communist parties of all countries.

Secondly, by a semi-proletariat of half-peasantry, i.e., those who make their livelihood partly by wage labour in capitalist agricultural enterprises, and partly by working on their own rented allotments, which provide them only with a portion of the products required. This group of the agricultural population is numerous in almost all capitalist countries; its existence, however, and its special position are thrown into the background by the representatives of the bourgeoisie and the Yellow, so-called Socialists of the Second International, who, partly wilfully, deceive the workers who are influenced by the routine of middle-class notions, and confuse it with the general mass of the "peasantry." This system of bourgeois deception of the workers is most observable in Germany and in France, also in America and other countries. Under a proper organisation of the Communist Party, this group will be one of its main supporters; in view of the fact that the position of such proletarians is acute, and they stand to gain from the Soviet and the dictatorship of the proletariat immediate and extensive benefits.

Thirdly, the petty peasantry, that is to say, the small landowners possessing or renting small allotments which hardly provide the demands of their own families and do not use hired labour. This section of the proletariat also stands to gain by the victory of the proletariat, as it is likely to afford it fully and immediately freedom from rent and tithes. This applies to the wine-growers (a) of France, and to sections of the peasantry in Italy; (b) it will liberate them of hypothetical debts; (c) of a number of forms of oppression and dependence upon the large landowners, as for instance the prohibition to use afforested land, etc.; (d) immediate assistance in their husbandry by the proletarian government, by the supply of agricultural machinery, and partly by the use of the structures and houses of the large capitalist farms expropriated by the proletariat; the immediate transfer to the proletarian state, of agricultural co-operatives and societies of such organisations, which under the capitalist system, served the needs of the rich and middle peasantry, but are now to entirely serve the poorer part of the proletariat, the semi-proletariat, the petty peasantry and so forth.

At the same time the Communist Party must clearly recognise the fact that the transitory period from Capitalism to Communism, that means to say, the dictatorship of the proletariat, among this class, slight concessions in the sphere of free trade unlimited, and the rights of private ownership, are inevitable, for this class which are the salesmen (although not to

a large extent), of the articles of need, have become corrupted by profiteering and old habits. However, under a firm proletarian policy, when the proletariat have felt the whip of the victorious landowners and rich peasantry on their backs, this class cannot fail to recognise the fact that it lies in their interest to take sides with the proletarian revolution.

Summarising, the three mentioned groups of village population, form the majority in all capitalist lands. Therefore the proletarian revolution, not only in the towns, but also in the villages, is sure of victory. The opposite opinion is widely spread, but is maintained only in the first place by the systematic deception of bourgeois science and statistics, thus throwing the exploiters, landowners and capitalists into the background, dividing the semi-proletariats and the petty peasantry into one group, and the rich peasantry into another. In the second place, this opinion holds good, thanks to the incapability and bad-will of the heroes of the Second International, and the corrupted, Imperialist privileges of the "working aristocracy," which holds back the real proletarian revolutionary work of propaganda, agitation and organisation amongst the village poor. The opportunists turned their whole attention as to how to best work out, both theoretically and practically, the concessions with the bourgeoisie, including the rich and middle peasantry (of them, see below). They paid no attention to the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois Government by the proletariat. In the third place, it holds good in face of the already existing stubborn prejudice (which is in conjunction with all bourgeois-democratic and Parliamentary prejudices), that is, they cannot understand the truth, which has been proved by theoretical Marxism, and confirmed by the Russian proletarian revolution, that the village population of the three above-mentioned categories which have become divided up, oppressed, and convicted in all the leading countries to a half-barbaric state of existence, that this village population, if it has an economic, social and cultural interest in the victory of Socialism, is capable of supporting the revolutionary proletariat only after they have gained political power, only after the rich landowners and capitalists have been finally settled with, only after these down-trodden people see in practice, that at their head stands an organised leader and protector, who is powerful, and firm enough to help and guide them.

4. Under the term "middle-peasantry," economically, are to be understood the petty landowners who hold land either by purchase or by rent. The land may consist only of small allotments, but yet, under the capitalist system, is sufficient to support house and home; besides, a surplus, which at the best, could be turned into capital. In the second place, these landowners, especially where there are only two or three on the farm, often engage hired labour. Germany may be given as a concrete example of middle peasantry in a leading capitalist country. According to statistics of 1907, here, on an allotment of from 6 to 10 hectares, about a third of the labourers working on there were hired. In France, where special branches of industry are cultivated, such as grape-growing, which demands intense working on the land, the amount of hired workers to a corresponding number of hectares would be still larger.

During the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is impossible for the revolutionary proletariat to set itself the task of winning over this class to its side, but must limit itself to (here are the exact figures): The number of farms from 5-10—(on 5,736,082). Number of hired labourers 437,704, against 2,003,688 workers belonging to the family in Austria; according to statistics of 1910, there were 383,831 farms, belonging to this group, from which 126,186 engaged hired labour. Hired labourers numbered 146,644 workers, belonging to the family 1,263,969. Altogether, there are 2,556,349 farms in Austria, neutralising it in the fight between proletariat and bourgeoisie. It cannot be overlooked that this class will sway now to this and then then to that side, and at the beginning of a new era in the advanced capitalist countries, will tend to be for the bourgeoisie: this is influenced by the psychology of the proprietors and their opinion; the interest to consecrate profiteering in "free" trade is direct; antagonism to hired labourers immediate. The victorious proletariat will directly improve the position of the hired labourer, doing away with rent and hypothesis. The proletarian power in the majority of the capitalist states should not introduce the abolishing of private property immediately, but in any case should ensure the petty and middle peasantry, not only of their allotments, but also of their being increased to the extent of an ordinary hired piece of ground (the abolishing of rent).

By uniting measures of this kind with a merciless fight with the bourgeoisie, the policy of neutralisation is ensured. The transfer to collective agriculture should be accomplished with great caution, and gradually. No violence should be exercised against the middle peasantry.

5. The rich peasantry form the capitalistic undertakings in agriculture. According to general rule, they engage a number of hired labourers. They themselves are united with the "peasantry" only by a low cultural standard, habits of life and physical labour on their farms. This class is the direct and decided enemy of the revolutionary proletariat. The whole attention of the village Communist parties must be turned towards the fight with this class, and the freeing of the workers from under the yoke of the exploiters.

(Continued in our next week's issue.)

FRENCH MINERS DEMAND EQUAL PAY FOR ALL GRADES.

The French Miners' Union of the Loire District, asks the French Miners' National Federation to obtain recognition for their claim that wages are to be the same for all mine-workers of all ages, whether employed below or on the surface, the only variation being that workers are to have an additional allowance for each dependant. The Loire miners contend that their cost of living has increased to five times, and demand a wages increase to that amount. They further demand one franc a day per dependant, free coal, free lodging and medical attendance, compensation for sickness, and a pension of £60 a year at 55 years of age. Some of these objects have already been obtained.

As long as the capitalist system remains, the workers will be exploited. Nevertheless, these demands of the French miners show that although the essential need for overthrowing the capitalist system has not been grasped by them, their policy is tending in a Communistic direction. They are reaching out towards the social conditions set up by the Russian Workers' Soviets. The French workers will, of course, discover that they cannot secure what the Russian Soviets have achieved until they have achieved their own Soviets.

BOOK REVIEW.

THE STORY OF A COMMUNIST.

("James Muir," by T. Anderson. Published by the I.P.S.M., 17, Oswald Street, Glasgow. Price: 4d.)

There is no need to introduce to the reader Comrade Tom Anderson, who is well known throughout the Communist movement as the founder of that militant organisation, the International Proletarian School Movement. Since it was inaugurated, Comrade Tom Anderson has held the editorship of its official organ, the "Red Dawn." In this booklet, as in all his booklets, is told the story of working-class life. It is significant because of the way in which the author clings to the grim reality of life. It is a true story, yet it reads like fiction. The author is entitled to tell us the life of Jim Muir, the Communist, because he was a personal friend and comrade to him. Jim Muir was a "Communist Agitator," who played his silent part in the cause of working-class emancipation. The author says thus of him: "Jimmie was not a speaker. I never heard him speak in my life at a meeting. He was a worker." The author, in his usual style, is plain and simple in his writing. He takes advantage of the opportunity to expose the shams of the capitalist system. Really, this booklet is also a text-book of Communism. He points out the real function of the State in a most interesting and striking manner. He warns the reader of the error of putting faith in "leaders," whose function is to betray the workers by doping them with reforms, and the author proceeds to explain that, as shown by scientific Communism, the only hope of the workers lies in a Communist Revolution. In short, the author deals with every phase of Communism. It should be read by young and old alike. When read, hand it to a fellow-worker who is not yet converted, and it is sure to succeed.

The Communist Movement.

On Tuesday, November 16th, at 8 p.m., there will be a meeting at the International Socialist Club, 28, East Road, City Road, to discuss the general position of the Communist Movement in Britain, and the attitude of our Party to the Third International and to Parliamentary Groups. Comrade F. Tyler will open the discussion.

All members are asked to attend.

W. CORNWALLIS.
(Soho Branch).

Just as we were going to press, we learn that the flat of ex-Colonel Malone, situated at Chalk Farm, has been raided by officers from Scotland Yard, and a quantity of literature and documents taken pending inquiries.

THE PLEBS

Journal of Proletarian Education.

New Series 6d. 32 Pages

The only "Left Wing" Monthly in Britain.

From all Labour Bookstalls. Or (post paid) 8d., from Plebs League, 11a Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W.2.

NATIONAL SECRETARY'S NOTES.

By EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD.

Communists and Parliament.

This very vexed question, which is practically all that hinders real unity of Communists in this country, is still far from being understood.

There are not merely two, but at least four different tactics which Communists in Britain might adopt with regard to Parliament, making their choice of tactic judging from conditions.

To clear the air, we will put these four quite plainly.

1. *Revolutionary Parliamentarism.* This was advocated by Liebknecht in 1874, and led to the debacle of the German Communists. Much the same tactic was advocated by the S.D.P. about 1902, with much the same control of representatives and much the same relationship in regard to Party. The S.L.P. too, has been advocating nothing else for years. It reads nicely on paper. It acts miserably in practice. Query. Have the "Communists" who have recently sought Municipal Council honours, truly conducted their canvassing and mass-election tactics in line with the thesis?

2. *The Abstentionist Tactic.* This is as practised by the Sinn Feiners on a National ticket, and advocated by the Italians and others on a Communist ticket. I understand that our Comrade, Guy Aldred, may soon give this tactic a trial and see how it works. To experiment, is the essence of all scientific method. I should not be astonished if his campaign, as outlined in the *Spur*, did not prove more noteworthy than the fights Bradlaugh put up.

3. *Boycott of the Ballot Box.* A Mass Boycott with Mass Pickets at the polling booths, and strong anti-Parliamentary propaganda for educational and agitational purposes during the election. This is the usually accepted "anti-Parliamentarism."

4. *Non-Parliamentarism.* Taking no notice at all, but working straight for the General Strike and Armed Insurrection. Working mainly on the industrial field and with the workers, not with regard to voting, but with regard to action.

Now under one of these four tactics, every British Communist should have his choice. This divides them into four and not two sections. Personally, I am prepared to accept any of the three latter, as decided by Party discipline. I draw the line at Communists putting their noses into Parliament under any pretext whatever.

The traditional "fighting with your mouth," which is a curiosity of this country—one of the effects of "Freedom, Toleration and Democracy," preached by the Manchester Liberalism—makes the talking tactics very weak for the class-struggle here. Strikes on the Continent usually result in the military being called out very quickly. The traditional way of carrying on the class-war in this country has been very different, and that is what makes the Parliamentary tactics so weak for British Communists. Cannot Maiden Lane make a sacrifice to the "irreconcilables," and throw over tactic No. 1, for a period of five years for a trial, and work on either No. 2, 3, or 4? If the class-war is not won in that period, we can then take stock again. I am convinced that by doing this, they would achieve a workable unity. I appeal to them to do this, as I am convinced that without this sacrifice, the "United British Communist Party" will be a sham.

The Second International

The manifesto of the Second International has appeared. It is so flimsy and threadbare, that a tyro in the class-war could rip it to tatters. It is not likely to attract a single Class-Warrior. Had it been drafted by the capitalists themselves, to split the workers' movement, it could not have been better done. It is the Henderson and Thomas pyramid in this country, that is backing such treachery. The Second International stands for Social Democracy and the Hendersons and Thomases enjoying bourgeois standards of living. The Third International stands for Dictatorship of the Workers, and Economic Equality throughout the whole of the sharers in the Class Struggle.

Another Eye-Witness.

Our Comrade, William Leslie, of the Aberdeen Communist Group of this Party, returned from Moscow last week. He was imprisoned three times in Sweden, on his way back, and hunger-struck for three days in Bergen prison. I put the straight question to him. Are the yarns in the capitalist papers, as to the condition of the Russian workers, anything like fact? Leslie informs me that the Russian workers are every bit as well off as the British workers, the Russian children are bonnier and happier than the British children, and beggars are unknown to-day in Moscow, where formerly they swarmed in thousands. That is straight from the nose-bag.

Brace and Hartshorn.

It is good news that the attacks of the rank and file comrades in South Wales, have resulted in the unmasking of yet two more of the sellers of our class.

The first rushes away to the shelter of a soft Governmental position, as a reward of the capitalists for the good work he has done for them, for bluffing the workers so successfully. The second will no doubt follow in the steps of Stanton and Roberts, and go in on Tory and Liberal votes as "official labour," whenever his seat is contested.

We congratulate our comrades in South Wales, on their success, and trust they will push the attack

still further. But the mere removal of unsound leaders is not enough. So long as their positions are taken by men who will draw the same salary that these men have drawn, Welsh workers can only expect to be sold. It is the system and not the men who are wrong. The system of overpaying the "representatives" of labour, will always result in "sellers out." Until the rank and file attack the whole pernicious system that produces men of the type of Brace and Hartshorn, and overthrows the whole pyramid of graft that baulks Labour of its victory, no real progress can be gained.

It's the System That Matters.

The same fallacy exists, whenever assassinations are tried as a remedy for evils. One tyrant is killed, but a worse arises to take his place. It is necessary to examine the causes that produce such men as Thomas, Clynes, Barnes, Roberts, Burns, Richard Bell, Shackleton, Brace, Hartshorn, Brownlie, and their tribe from the ranks of the workers. It is necessary to examine the whole structure and system of that pyramid of grafters, by which bloated Trade Union bureaucracy acts as a department of the State, in suppressing and misleading the workers and keeping them on the fodder basis. The cause, as always, is economic, and lies in the bloated salaries of these traitors. Make the wage of all persons working in the Labour Movement the same wage as the workers, make every "representative" liable to recall, and nineteen-twentieths of the trouble with traitors in our ranks would cease. There is no earthly reason why Brace should not have had £5 5s. per week, the same wage as the miner, throughout his career as "official," for his economic needs are precisely the same as those of the miner's. In fact, if he had the triumph of the workers at heart, he would have been proud to work in the movement at the exact economic level of the rank and file, and ashamed to have enjoyed a superior economic status than those for whom he was fighting.

This is the acid-test between the real and fake representatives of Labour. Are they willing to work for the same economic status as the worker? If they are not, there are hundreds of equally gifted and brainy wage-slaves who are; and the sooner grafters quit, the healthier for the Movement.

The New D.O.R.A.

A new bill is going through Parliament, threatening terrible penalties for those who interfere with the food-supply "of the people." The first persons to be indicted under it should be the capitalists themselves, for there are over a million unemployed, (counting their dependants), and the food-supply of these million citizens is seriously being interfered with by the robbers and thieves who hold the dictatorship. With nothing to sell but their labour power, these unemployed are forced by capitalism to starvation. Willing to work and to produce, they are forced to idleness and divorced from the land and all tools of production. Worse off than the slaves of the Southern States, who at least had a master and were fed, they go to swell the reservoir of surplus labour that is one of the necessities of the capitalist system, in order to keep down the price of the labour commodity. Robbed of good food, good shelter, good clothes, culture, education, and all that makes life worth living, they are doomed by the capitalist dictatorship to an existence worse than pigs. The day of retribution, under a Workers' D.O.R.A. will not long be delayed. The rumble of revolt of the World Slaves against the World Ghouls grows louder and louder. The chains are burst in Russia. Here we are preparing the hammer. Join the Communist Party and aid in the work.

N.B.—COMRADE WILLIAM LESLIE arrived in England on November 2nd. He was in prison three times in Sweden, and deprived of all his books and papers, so is unable to communicate with Comrades as desired.

FROM THE HEART OF THE NEW CIVILISATION.

Winston Churchill and others are prating of the collapse of civilisation in Russia. Once more they are given the lie by the news from Moscow, that the engineer, Makhonin, has elaborated a project for the construction of a giant airship, capable of carrying 1,000 persons, at a speed of 66 miles an hour. Soviet Russia did not pigeon-hole the plan, but appointed a committee of experts to inquire into it. The experts have reported favourably, and the airship will be produced and employed by the Workers' Republic.

DANCING

AT

400 Old Ford Road

Every Saturday

From 7 till 11 o'clock.

THE FUTILITY OF FORCE.

A Reply from Rev. G. T. SADLER, M.A., LL.B.

Dear Editor,—You have kindly inserted two replies to my earnest question, "Why use force?" but I cannot see that in either of them your case is made out. No one wants force, of course, but are those who want a new social order to arm secretly, learn to shoot, and be ready to kill their fellow-men, if they resist?

You say "Yes." I say, "Force only breeds force." You will only get a see-saw, an endless series of reprisals, which is called WAR, as in Russia for three years, and as in Ireland now. Indeed, the Great War was reprisals on land and sea!

Christianity is not infallible in all its ideas, but it clearly abrogated the *Lex talionis*, and said "Love your enemies and do them good."

If your readers will quietly sit down and read Matthew v. 38—48, Luke vi. 27—38, and Romans xii. 19—21, they will see that Christianity condemns the war method.

You may say you do not reject it, nevertheless. Then I say that, apart from the New Testament, killing leads to more killing, and deepens hate for centuries. Compare France and Germany since 1648, when Alsace was won by France. The two have been deadly enemies since that Thirty Years' War, ending in 1648. France still fears Germany, and hence her treaty with Belgium, whose terms are secret, in spite of her signing the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Milton wrote "What doth war but endless war still breed?" It is a stupid method. Surely the Great War has proved that!

You may ask, but how are we to secure the land and factories for popular use and control except by force?

I reply, by a series of spiritual, non-violent methods:—

(1) *Education.* Plan the New Order reasonably, and teach it to all. The New Order will have no State, which is based on force, but be a Co-operative Commonwealth of free groups or guilds of work, with pensions for all at an early date. Each guild will manage its own affairs and pensions. Prices will be controlled by representatives of the public (consumers) and the Guild, in each case. The force-method is a stupid hurry-method. It is putting the roof on before you have laid the foundations—to be "Irish." In other words, it won't work.

(2) *The General Strike:* not a local or sectional strike, or one of the "Triple Alliance," but one of all who seek a just and jolly new England, Wales, Ireland, Scotland—and World! The strike is not force. It is a refusal to work for wages for landlords and companies. There are here 66,000 Limited Companies, with a paid-up capital of £3,210,000,000. We can't buy them out. We want to turn each into a group of workers, and co-ordinate them into guilds, with prices fixed from time to time. We can strike to work no longer for freeholders and shareholders. (I say this, though it hits myself.) We want brotherly groups, not competing interests of idle or active shareholders and workers. We want one Commonwealth Bank, not the banks now living by interest, which is unearned.

(3) *Pension off the freeholders and shareholders.* Let us be harsh to no one: but not compensate them, for the old system of rent and interest and profits, though not all evil, was, and is for the most part, unjust exploitation.

Now, you say the the rich will not come into such a New Order without using force. Try it and see! Seek a spiritual revival on these lines. The Russian Revolution of March, 1917, was not by force. The soldiers also "struck work." They refused to act for Czarism any more. But when Lenin and his friends seized the Government and used force to seize lands and bank balances and to disarm all others, endless wars arose, and the Capitalist States of France and Britain backed up the local capitalism and landlordism in Russia. There is no end to the pagan, futile force-method. It has been war for three years—and so the misery (due to the great war and blockade) could not there be repaired in Russia.

I beg your readers to consider these things, and accept the deeper powers of truth, and of moral resistance to evil to bring in a New Order. I do not offer "a tract to a tiger," as one of your writers suggests. The capitalist is not a tiger. But I do not offer him a tract either. I offer him a general, calm refusal to go on with the wage system, and ask him to come in and help us as a manager in a jollier system, and get a pension, too! Let us have a trust in the MAN in men, who is called the "Christ" in the New Testament. "Christ" was not a man, but the MAN in all men, and the story of Christ was originally the story of how men, by dying to the "old man," rise to be the Christ-man of creative Love and so share the work and wealth of life.

Yours faithfully,

GILBERT T. SADLER.

	Each.	Doz.
Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, by Lenin	2d.	1/6
Soviets for the British, by L. A. Motler	11d.	1/1
Soviets or Parliament, by Bukharin	1d.	9d.
Hands Off Russia, by Israel Zangwill	2d.	1/6
A Year in Soviet Russia	2d.	1/6

DREADNOUGHT DEVELOPMENT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
S. Gardiner	2	0	
G. Sear	5	0	
Mr. and Mrs. Roodzant	1	0	0
J. Leakey	1	10	0
Miss E. Stephenson	1	0	0
Anonymous	2	4	
G. Ablant	1	0	0
Miss E. M. Brett	10	0	
G. L. Jones	10	0	

Brought forward from last week	45	8	1
Total	51	7	5

To Miss Melvina Walker,—

Dear Comrade, we the undersigned, desirous of acknowledging the brave stand made by our Comrade Sylvia Pankhurst, have pleasure in enclosing the sum of £1, which we leave to her to deal with as she thinks fit, either for her own personal use, or as a contribution to the *Workers' Dreadnought* Development Fund, knowing as we do, that the fight that Sylvia and the *Dreadnought* is waging is the only one that matters. We only wish it lay in our power to send a much larger sum.

Long live the *Dreadnought* and its policy.

With fraternal greetings,

Yours for the cause,

J. TIERNEY.

ERNEST HANDS.

(Members of the Birmingham Branch of the Communist Party).

[The £1 has been placed to the *Dreadnought* Development Fund].

COMMUNIST PARTY, B.S.T.I.**Comrade Fred Tyler**

Just returned from 10 weeks' tour through England and Scotland, is willing to speak at any

Communist or Socialist Branch
on

"The General Situation of the Movement and Party."

No fees. Collection in aid of

"Workers' Dreadnought" Fund.

Apply Fred Tyler, 33, Denbigh Rd., Willesden, N.W. 10.

CARDIFF CONFERENCE.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4th, 1920.

ALL BRANCHES and other ANTI-PARLIAMENTARY GROUPS desirous of being represented are requested to place all matter for the Agenda in the hands of the National Secretary on or before the 20th November.

Each Branch and Group participating is entitled to have one delegate, who should present a Credential signed by his Branch Secretary stating card vote of Branch or Group.

All rail fares pooled, so cost to each Branch and Group is the same.

EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD,
National Secretary,
8, Sinclair Gardens,
West Kensington,
London, W. 14.

**COMMUNIST PARTY
TRAFALGAR SQUARE****MASS MEETING
SUNDAY NOVEMBER 14th**

at 2.30 p.m. prompt.

Subject, **COMMUNISM.**

Speakers, Comrades J. Steele, Beacham, Thomas, Birch, O'Sullivan, Bishop, Cornwallis, and others.

TO LINK UP**UNEMPLOYED MOVEMENT**

Will Committees and Others desirous of forming same, communicate with

H. W. Emery, 153, Melbourne Rd. Coventry.

See Coventry Unemployed Workers' Committee.

COMMUNIST PARTY

British Section of the Third International.

CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.—The acceptance of the following points: (1) The complete overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism. (2) The Class struggle. (3) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (4) The Soviet or Revolutionary Workers' Council system. (5) Affiliation to the Third International. (6) Refusal to engage in Parliamentary Action. (7) Non-affiliation to the Labour Party.

MINIMUM WEEKLY SUBSCRIPTION: Three pence.

Entry Fee: One Shilling.

Provisional Secretary: EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD, 8, Sinclair Gardens, West Kensington, London, W. 14.

Branches' notes and list of meetings, sent in for publication, should reach the Secretary not later than first post Thursday morning.—All articles and news matter (other than Branches' notes) to be sent to: 400, Old Ford Road, Bow, London, E.3. and marked: "The Editor, The Workers' Dreadnought."

The "WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" may be obtained for sale at 3/- per quire (26 copies). Usual Trade rates for wholesale and retail newsagents.

All Members should make a special effort to see that our paper is on sale and posters displayed at local newsagents, trade union branches, in the workshop and at all public meetings in their districts.

BRANCH NOTES.**Newport.**

Comrade F. Wadge, 22, Corelli Street, Newport, Mon., is desirous of forming a Branch of the Party for Newport. Will all class-conscious rebels round Newport get into touch with this comrade.

Swansea.

Local comrades are steadily active in their respective sections, steadily planting the spirit of Communism at every opportunity. Our outdoor meeting, this week, had a remarkably attentive audience, especially bearing in mind the activity of the local capitalist press, in misrepresenting the Communists. There are many more regular *Dreadnought* buyers in Swansea than Branch members, which is a sign that instead of shouldering equal responsibility in working through to Communism, some Swansea comrades are making progress slower than it need be. Secretary Penny, c/o 60, Alexandria Road, Swansea, appeals to all local supporters of the Third International to rally to the standard of the local Communist Branch.

Branch Secretaries are requested to compile Branch notes weekly, and forward to the National Secretary not later than Thursdays for the succeeding week's issue.

COMMUNIST PARTY (B.S.T.I.)**Branch Directory.**

CAMBERWELL.—Comrade Kloots, 27, South Grove, Peckham, S.E. 15.

POPLAR.—Mrs. Walker, 168, East India Dock Road, E. 14.

BOW.—Miss N. Smyth, 400, Old Ford Road, E. 3.

BARKING.—D. Roodzant, Glenhurst, Ripple Road, Barking, E.

HAMMERSMITH.—H. Biske, 22, Rockley Road, Shepherd's Bush, W.

MANCHESTER.—Frank Elder, 36, Brunswick Road, Broadheath, Cheshire.

GORTON.—E. Redfern, Gore Brook Hall, William Street, Gorton, Manchester.

PORTSMOUTH.—M. E. Marsh, 12, St. Johns Road, Fratton, Portsmouth.

SHEFFIELD.—A. Carford, 183, West Street, Sheffield.

EXETER.—C. Lucy, 8, Okehampton Road, Exeter.

HOLT.—H. E. Durham, Co-operative Land and Crafts Guild, Cromer Road, Holt, Norfolk.

PORTH.—D. A. Davies, 38, Cemetery Road, Porth, South Wales.

HULL.—F. Jackson, 62, Hawthorne Avenue, Hull.

SOHO.—W. Cornwallis, 13, Eaton Row, Eaton Sq., S.W. 1.

STEPNEY.—S. Ginsburg, c/o International Socialist Club, 28, East Road, City Road, N. 1.

HYDE PARK INTERNATIONAL.—J. Steele, 126, Portobello Road, Notting Hill, W.

MERTHYR.—H. Griffiths, 60, Quarry Row, Merthyr Tydfil, South Wales.

TRE THOMAS and MACHEN.—H. Price, 14, Glyn Gwyn, Tre Thomas, Monmouthshire.

STAINES, ASHFORD, and EGHAM.—A. J. Silvester, 4, Factory Path, Staines, Middlesex.

SOUTH SHIELDS.—J. Beadham, 18, Osborn Avenue, South Shields, Durham.

BIRMINGHAM.—R. V. Harvey, 314, High Street, Harborne, Birmingham.

COVENTRY.—H. M. Emery, 153, Melbourne Road, Coventry.

SWANSEA.—E. Penny, c/o 60, Alexandra Road, Swansea.

CENTRAL.—H. Bernard, c/o "Dreadnought" Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

ALTRINCHAM.—J. Whinfield, 62, Brunswick Rd., Broadheath, Cheshire.

GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

J. Hall, 20a; Stepney Comrades, 30a; "W.L." 50a.

LONDON MEETINGS: OUTDOOR.**Whitechapel.**

Osborne Street, Sundays, at 11.45 a.m.

Poplar.

Dock Gates, Sundays, at 7 p.m.

Camberwell.

Saturday, 13th, Hanover Park, Rye Lane, at 7.30.

Comrade Cornwallis.

Sundays, Peckham Rye, at 11 a.m.

Soho.

The Broadway, Golden Square. Every Thursday at 7.30 p.m.

Hammersmith.

The Grove. Every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Willesden.

Manor Park Road, next Friday, October 29th. Comrades R. Bishop and F. Willson.

Bow.

St. Stephen's Road. Every Saturday at 6.30 p.m.

Birmingham.

Bull Ring. Every Friday at 7.30. Every Sunday at 7 p.m.

Stepney.

Mile End Waste (opposite Stepney Green). Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. Local Communist speakers. Every Friday at 8.15 p.m. Osborne Street, Whitechapel. The City of London branch has now been affiliated with this branch.

Barking.

Near Barking Station, every Saturday at 6 p.m.

INDOOR BRANCH MEETINGS.**Soho International.**

58, Old Compton Street, Soho, W. Every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. prompt.

Bow.

400, Old Ford Road. Every Thursday at 7.30 p.m.

Poplar.

20, Railway Street. Every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Camberwell.

16, Peckham Road, Mondays, at 7.45 p.m.

Hull.

Argyle House, Anlaby Road. Every Wednesday night at 8 p.m.

Hammersmith.

Labour Rooms, 154, Goldhawk Road, Shepherd's Bush. Every Monday at 8 p.m. All Party members and inquirers welcome.

Barking.

All indoor meetings are held at Glenhurst, Ripple Road.

HYDE PARK PROPAGANDA GROUP.

Sundays, at 11.30 a.m. Prince of Wales, Harrow Rd., Paddington.

Sundays, from 4 p.m. till 10 p.m. Hyde Park, Marble Arch.

Wednesdays, at 7.30 p.m. Garrould's Corner, Edgware Road.

Thursdays, at 7.30 p.m. Prince of Wales, Harrow Road.

Saturdays, 6 p.m. till 10 p.m. Hyde Park, Marble Arch.

**MALTHUSIANISM
BIRTH-CONTROL METHODS**

by

PROFESSOR G. HARDY.

Translated from the 45th French Edition.
39 Illustrations.

Price 3s. 6d. post free.

"Professor Hardy spares no pains in pointing out why parental prudence would be productive of so much good in ameliorating the conditions under which the poor live. His arguments are concise, clear and conclusive. He then shows the latest and most hygienic methods known to science which can be practised by even the poorest couples. In fact, the work is a perfect encyclopaedia on Neo-Malthusianism and should be found in every household and read by all married people and those about to marry." THE TRUTHSEEKER.

The book is only supplied to persons over 21 years of age. State age when ordering from

**J. W. COTT, Secretary Liberator League,
61, Dorset Street, Bradford.**

Printed at the Agenda Press (T.U.), 10, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4, and Published by the Communist Party at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.