

The Thomas Libel Case.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. VIII. No. 39.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10TH, 1921.

[WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CURRENT TOPICS.

At the time of writing, the Dailies have, in black headlines: "Grave Irish Developments," adding that the Prime Minister has been closeted with the King for over an hour. The Labour Party has stated that the English

In another part of the paper, an excerpt from a book of Bastiat, an economist of the last generation, clearly shows the inherent antagonism of the capitalist producers against the collective interests of the nation.

taking form, after the defeat of the Government of Germany, amongst the Capitalist Allied Governments.

It is always advisable, when you intend to rob your neighbour, to have a few well-chosen, polite



THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER.

people will not accept another war on Ireland; but the Labour Party being a purely political and Parliamentary body, whatever its single individual members may be, might give a totally different statement to-morrow, if that were to suit its electoral interests.

Again, a good deal of excitement is made over the question of the individual allegiance of the members of the Dail, as against a collective allegiance.

Since, to the Communists, all political palaver is but the superstructure of economic forces, the position appears to be thus: Ulster capitalist interests do not desire to merge in an all-Ireland political unity; for, in such case, they might have, in order to produce profits, to face the competition of purely English industries. Belfast dockyards may be cut off from orders of the British Government, because a New Ireland would not have—at least, for many years to come—a Navy, or a Marine of its own.

Political and religious prejudices are played upon and made use of to defend such vested interests.

The Sinn Fein interests are mainly agricultural, and coincide with the rise of a Nationalist petty-bourgeoisie. In spite of the great heroism of the humble masses, the voice of the workers is, at present, but little heard in the conclaves of Sinn Fein.

That view is confirmed by a letter from the Secretaries of the Rubber Shareholders' Association. In the current issue of the *Mining World* appears the following letter:—

"In view of the present position of the rubber planting industry, it is of the greatest importance that any increase of output should be avoided. My committee, therefore, desires to give the utmost possible support to the appeal which has just been published by the Rubber Growers' Association . . ."

Rubber has become an article of first necessity, in the modern world; yet restricted production is advocated, because more profitable to certain vested capitalist interests. The same policy is apparent, *vide* trade papers, in other industries, and it is one of the chief reasons—not, of course, the primary cause—of unemployment.

The Washington Conference managed to conduct its business without the presence of Lloyd George: one wonders how it could be.

Many of these International Conferences are simply held in order to give a show of activity and usefulness to the limpets of the diplomatic service, and to provide innocent peregrinations to Labour Fakirs. This of Washington aimed at the discovery of where the centre of gravity rests, in the new "Balance of Power" that is

and pious phrases handy. In this case, secret diplomacy (which is still much alive, notwithstanding the praiseworthy efforts of our friends of the U.D.C.) could work better behind the smoke-screen of "Disarmament." Since a great number of those who would have to do the killing in the next war, or, still worse, would have to stop bullets, have somewhat grown sick of the idea of warfare, the slogan of "Disarmament" was a good one, surely, to be taken up by all the liberal, the "Christian"-minded people, in order to trot out again their platitudes, which the after-the-war disillusion had almost placed on the scrap-heap.

A chance word, by Briand, concerning the deterioration, or the disorganisation, of the Italian army, almost set the would-be patriots of the two sister nations at each other's throats. We missed a Lilliputian war, out of the Conference on Disarmament. That is all we gained.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

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

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

SCARCITY VERSUS ABUNDANCE.

Capitalism is linked with scarcity; Communism with abundance.

The following extracts from "Sophismes Economiques," translated from the French of Frederick Bastiat, by Patrick James Stirling, LL.D., F.R.S.E., presents a striking picture of Capitalism. Bastiat wrote it as an argument against "Protection," but it is a remarkable indictment of the capitalist system. When buying and selling is abolished and mankind produces for the common use, no one, to paraphrase Bastiat's words, will dream of encouraging labour and rendering it more productive by breaking in pieces labour-saving machinery to neutralise the fertility of the shore, or to give back the gifts of the sea. Everyone would understand that when all are working together to supply the common needs, any circumstance that saves the people an hour of labour puts that hour at their disposal; they can devote it to increasing their enjoyment.

The Theory of Scarcity.

How does it happen that in the eyes of workmen, of publicists, and statesmen, abundance should appear a thing to be dreaded, and scarcity advantageous? I propose to trace this illusion to its source.

We remark that a man grows richer in proportion to the return yielded by his exertions, that is to say, in proportion as he sells his commodity at a higher price. He sells at a higher price in proportion to the rarity, to the scarcity, of the article he produces. We conclude from this that, as far as he is concerned at least, scarcity enriches him. Applying successively the same reasoning to all other producers, we construct the theory of scarcity. We next proceed to apply this theory, and, in order to favour producers generally, we raise prices artificially, and cause a scarcity of all commodities, by prohibition, by restriction, by the suppression of machinery, and other analogous means.

The same thing holds of abundance. We observe that when a product is plentiful, it sells at a lower price, and the producer gains less. If all producers are in the same situation, they are all poor. Therefore it is abundance that ruins society. And as theories are soon reduced to practice, we see the law struggling against the abundance of commodities.

No Scarcity If Man Did Not Exchange.

If man were a solitary animal, if he laboured exclusively for himself, if he consumed directly the fruit of his labour—in a word, if he did not exchange—the theory of scarcity would never have appeared in the world. It is too evident that, in that case, abundance would be advantageous, from whatever quarter it came, whether from the result of his industry, from ingenious tools, from powerful machinery of his invention, or whether due to the fertility of the soil, the liberality of nature, or even to a mysterious invasion of products brought by the waves and left by them upon the shore. No solitary man would ever have thought that, in order to encourage his labour and render it more productive, it was necessary to break in pieces the instruments which saved it, to neutralise the fertility of the soil, or give back to the sea the good things it had brought to his door. He would perceive at once that labour is not an end, but a means; and that it would be absurd to reject the result for fear of doing injury to the means by which that result was accomplished. He would perceive that if he devotes two hours a day to providing for his wants, any circumstance (machinery, fertility, gratuitous gift, no matter what) which saves him an hour of that labour, the result remaining the same, puts that hour at his disposal, and that he can devote it to increasing his enjoyments; in short, he would see that to save labour is nothing else than progress.

But exchange disturbs our view of a truth so simple. In the social state, and with the separation of employments to which it leads, the production and consumption of a commodity are not mixed up and confounded in the same individual. Each man comes to see in his own labour no longer a means but an end. In rela-

tion to each commodity, exchange creates two interests, that of the producer and that of the consumer; and these two interests are always directly opposed to each other.

Capitalist Producers' Interest.

It is essential to analyse them, and examine their nature.

Take the case of any producer whatever, what is his immediate interest? It consists of two things: first, that the fewest possible number of persons should devote themselves to his branch of industry; secondly, that the greatest possible number of persons should be in quest of the article he produces. Political economy explains it more succinctly in these terms: Supply very limited, demand very extended; or, in other words, still, competition limited, demand unlimited.

What is the immediate interest of the consumer? That the supply of the product in question should be extended, and the demand restrained.

Seeing, then, that two interests are in opposition to each other, one of them must necessarily coincide with the social interests in general, and the other be antagonistic to them.

But which of them should legislation favour, as identical with the public good—if, indeed, it should favour either?

To discover this, we must inquire what would happen if the secret wishes of men were granted. In as far as we are producers, it must be allowed that the desire of every one of us is anti-social. Are we vine-dressers? It would give us no great regret if hail should shower down on all the vines in the world except our own; this is the theory of scarcity. Are we iron-masters? Our wish is that there should be no other iron in the market but our iron, however much the public may be in want of it; and for no other reason than that this want, keenly felt and imperfectly satisfied, shall ensure us a higher price: this is still the theory of scarcity. Are we farmers? We say with M. Bugeaud: Let bread be dear, that is to say, scarce, and agriculturists will thrive: always the same theory, the theory of scarcity.

Are we physicians? We cannot avoid seeing that certain ameliorations, improving the sanitary state of the country, the development of certain moral virtues, such as moderation and temperance, the progress of knowledge tending to enable each man to take better care of his own health, the discovery of certain simple remedies of easy application, would be so many blows to our professional success. In as far as we are physicians, then, our secret wishes would be anti-social. I do not say that physicians form these secret wishes. On the contrary, I believe they would hail with joy the discovery of a universal panacea; but they would not do this as physicians, but as men and Christians. By a noble abnegation of self, the physician places himself in the consumer's point of view. But as exercising a profession, from which he derives his own and his family's subsistence, his desires, or, if you will, his interests, are anti-social.

Are we manufacturers of cotton stuffs? We desire to sell them at the price most profitable to ourselves. We should consent willingly to an interdiction being laid on all rival manufacturers; and if we could venture to give this wish public expression, or hope to realise it with some chance of success, we should attain our end, to some extent, by indirect means; for example, by excluding foreign fabrics, in order to diminish the supply, and thus produce, forcibly and to our profit, a scarcity of clothing.

What Montaigne Said.

In the same way, we might pass in review all other branches of industry, and we should always find that the producers, as such, have anti-social views. "The shopkeeper," says Montaigne, "thrives only by the irregularities of youth; the farmer by the high price of corn; the architect by the destruction of houses; the officers of justice, by lawsuits and quarrels. Ministers of religion derive their distinction and employment from our vices and our death. No physician re-

joices in the health of his friends, nor soldiers in the peace of their country; and so of the rest."

Hence it follows that if the secret wishes of each producer were realised, the world would retrograde towards barbarism. The sail would supersede steam, the oar would supersede the sail, and general traffic would be carried on the carrier's waggon; the latter would be superseded by the mule, and the mule by the pedlar. Wool would exclude cotton, cotton in its turn would exclude wool, and so on until the death of all things had caused man himself to disappear from the face of the earth.

Suppose for a moment that the legislative power and the public force were placed at the disposal of Mimeral's committee, and that each member of that association had the privilege of bringing in and sanctioning a favourite law, is it difficult to divine to what sort of industrial code the public would be subjected?

The Consumer's Point of View.

If we now proceed to consider the immediate interest of the consumer, we shall find that it is in perfect harmony with the general interest, with all that the welfare of society calls for. When the purchaser goes to market he desires to find it well stocked. Let the seasons be propitious for all harvests; let inventions, more and more marvellous, bring within reach a greater and greater number of products and enjoyments; let time and labour be saved; let distances be effaced by the perfection and rapidity of transit; let the spirit of justice and of peace allow of a diminished weight of taxation; let barriers of every kind be removed; in all this the interest of the consumer runs parallel with the public interest. The consumer may push his secret wishes to a chimerical and absurd length, without these wishes becoming antagonistic to the public welfare. He may desire that food and shelter, the hearth and the roof, instruction and morality, security and peace, power and health, should be obtained without exertion and without measure, like the dust of the highways, the water of the brook, the air which we breathe; and yet the realisation of his desires would not be at variance with the good of society.

It may be said that, if these wishes were granted, the work of the producer would become more and more limited, and would end with being stopped for want of ailment. But why? Because, on this extreme supposition, all imaginable wants and desires would be fully satisfied. Man, like Omnipotence, would create all things by a simple act of volition. Well, on this hypothesis, what reason should we have to regret the stoppage of industrial production?

"Economic Sophisms," By Frederick Bastiat. Fisher Unwin. 7s. 6d. New impression.

"Dreadnought" Development Fund.

J. N. £5, J. Claves 12s., A. W. Marsh 2s., H. Clifford 2s. 6d., Mrs. Carlberg 11s. 5d., H. J. Smith 2s. 2d., Mrs. Brimley 10s., Mrs. Hart 3s., T. White 17s. 6d., J. Burt 9s. 6d., A. Friend 6s., D. Scott field £3. Total, £11 15s. 1d.

ON SALE NOW.

SOVIET RUSSIA

AS I SAW IT

BY E. SYLVIA PANKHURST

TWO SHILLINGS and SIXPENCE.

What Readers say:—

"I re-read it and again enjoyed it. It is a very fine piece of work, simply written and quite devoid of pose."—Wm. J. Paul.

"Best report yet published."—CHARLES BEECH.

"I like it immensely, and I think it will rapidly become noted as one of the best travel books on Soviet Russia."—HENRIETTE ROLAND HOLST, Holland.

From "WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" OFFICE, 162, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.

IV.

By Charles Brower.

In this instalment we propose to give a survey of the *Ideologic Factors*—the development of ideas and social theories that accompanied the development of the material conditions, the manifold partial and incomplete attempts at explaining the historic-social laws and their leading up to the formulation of the doctrines of scientific Socialism.

Originally mankind began with common property in land—with Communism. This form of property, according to scientific investigations, must have prevailed amongst all races of men, and must have continued for a long time. As a result of this, Communism is organic with the race—the mass of mankind instinctively yearns for a return to this mode of life. And perfectly sound is this instinct of the mass; the tendency of social evolution is, indeed, towards a state of Communism—not a restoration of the old primitive common property, but the establishment of a far higher, better developed form of communal proprietorship, based upon the full benefit of modern discoveries in chemistry and mechanical inventions.

The yearning of the race for Communism manifested itself concretely in every social upheaval. Thus in modern times we find that, throughout the struggle between feudalism and the rising bourgeoisie, while the latter could justify claim to represent the interests of the working masses, because it represented the general tendency of social evolution, still, in every great bourgeois movement, there were independent outbursts of that class, which was the forerunner of the modern proletariat: in the Protestant Reformation—the Ana-Baptists; in the English Revolution of 1640—the Levellers; in the French Revolution—the Enragés, with the Commune as their organ; and then, Babeuf. As to the general character of these outbursts, the following will testify:

After the American Revolution and prior to the formation of the Federal Government, there occurred in different parts of the country uprisings of the masses. General Knox, then Secretary of War, who was sent by the Continental Congress to investigate, reported: "Their creed is that the property of the United States has been protected from the confiscation of Britain by the joint exertions of all, and, therefore, ought to be the common property of all."

The yearning after communal life likewise had its theoretical expressions from time to time. These, of course, corresponded with the degree of actual development, since great thinkers generally cannot rise above the limits imposed upon them by the particular epoch they live in. Thus Christianity, in forecasting the establishment of "the kingdom of Heaven on earth," was but the reflex, in a religious form, of the yearning of the masses for Communism.

In modern times, such intellectual expressions coincided with and served to pave the way for the rising bourgeoisie. Thus, in 1516, Thomas More, in his "Utopia," learned of a Wonderful Kingdom of Nowhere, in which all questions of labour, government, society and religion had been easily settled by simple justice and common sense. His Utopia, being but the forecast of the coming capitalist era, had as its foundation of society—liberty, fraternity, equality.

In the 18th century, the Utopians bore the character of actual Communistic theories. The demand was for social as well as political equality, and the abolition of class distinctions.

The great modern Utopians, who found many followers among the masses, and who actually set up Communistic colonies which were to serve as models for the reconstruction of society, were St. Simon, Fourier, and Robert Owen.

They flourished for a time, and at times were quite influential in the Labour movement. But neither could the Utopians become the leaders of, nor their teachings, the guides for the emancipation of the proletarian masses. For, while pointing out the evils of the bourgeois mode of production, they indicated no scientific means of overcoming them; while exposing the bourgeoisie as exploiters of the proletarian masses, they did not formulate any scientific doctrine by which

the proletariat might rid itself of its exploiters; while painting the Communist society in the most glorious colours, they failed to point out the road leading to the promised land. All alike were possessed of the following inherent weaknesses, arising from the fact that, at the time of their formulation, capitalist production had not as yet sufficiently developed to show its inherent contradictions, the conflicts they bring about and the means of ending these conflicts:

1. To them, Socialism (or Communism) was not the inevitable outcome of a long process of evolution, but a system based upon absolute truth, reason and justice, independent of time, space, and of the historical development of man.

2. They did not appear as the representatives of the interests of the proletariat. They appealed to the whole of society—nay, preferably to the rich and influential.

3. Utopian Socialism stood outside the State, did not recognise the functions of the State, and attempted to set up a Socialist commonwealth apart from and behind the back of the State.

Nevertheless, it were wrong to view, as some are wont to do, the Utopian schemes as failures.

Viewed historically, Utopian Socialism performed a useful as well as necessary function—a function which was a necessary link in the forging of the chain of proletarian class-consciousness and solidarity. On the one hand, it tore off the mask of the bourgeois world and its moral scoundrels, thereby exposing its true nature; on the other, it inspired the masses with a vision—an ideal state of society. Utopian Socialism was the predecessor of, and paved the way for, Scientific Socialism.

A scientific Socialist movement must be based on an appreciation of the primacy of the economic factors in society, the changes in the mode of production and exchange, the consequent consequent division of society into classes, and the struggle continually going on between these two classes.

To set up a Socialist theory on this fundamental basis necessitates the application of dialectics to the realm of sociology.

The old Greek philosophers had been dialecticians. But with the advance of the scientific era, mankind had unconsciously drifted away from the dialectic mode of reasoning, and substituted for it the meta-physical. This was due to the fact that each scientist being pre-occupied with the collection and collaboration of data in his own particular field of investigation, lost sight of the entirety—of the world as a whole. Hand in hand with the development of the capitalist mode of production went the rapid development of the sciences—for the sciences were the tools with which capitalism "taught mankind to conquer nature by an assault." This resulted in a vast accumulation of scientific facts and data, bringing about the need for unification principles. This need brought about the birth of the German school of philosophy, which resuscitated the dialectics of the Greeks. This school culminated and found its highest expression in Hegel.

Hegel taught that nature works dialectically: that she does not move in the eternal oneness of a perpetually recurring circle, but goes through a real historical evolution.

In Hegel's system, the whole world—natural, historical, intellectual—is represented as a process, as in constant motion, change, transformation, development; and the attempt is made to trace out the internal connection that makes a continuous whole of all this movement and development.

Hegel's philosophy was most revolutionary, because of its recognition of the inevitability of the historic process of evolution, of growth. In the course of its progress, the reality of yesterday becomes the unreality of to-day; it loses its necessity, which is at once its right of existence, its rationality. What was necessary, a vital reality, becomes unnecessary, loses its reality. "All that is real is rational, and all that is rational is real," apparently conservative, was most revolutionary.

Darwin had already applied dialectics to the domain of organic life. He dealt with the meta-physical conception of nature the heaviest blow by his proof that all organic beings, plants, animals, and man himself, are the products of a process of evolution going on through millions of years. Finally, in discovering the principle of transformation of species through "the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest," Darwin had found the propelling force, the cause of animal development.

In the realm of sociology, likewise, the time was becoming ripe for the discovery of the propelling force of social development.

The bourgeois mode of production had already advanced sufficiently to show its inherent contradictions; the proletariat as a class had already evolved and manifested its class character; already there had been sufficient conflicts between the proletariat and its masters, to indicate the political nature of the class-struggle. These combined factors made possible—nay, imperative—an intellectual expression of the aims of the proletariat; a formulation of the doctrines of scientific Socialism. Here Marx and Engels came to the fore, and served as the medium for this expression.

(to be continued)

AN ESPERANTO PRIMER.

Lesson III.

The letter G is pronounced in two ways, as in Good and in George; but it requires an accent *g* when pronounced as in George.

Ganto, *glove*; Gluo, *glue*; Grasa, *fat*.

Ĝardeno, *garden*; ĝi, (*gee*) it; ĝentilo, *polite*.

The letter J is also pronounced in two ways; when without an accent it is like a Y; but with the accent *j*, it is like a soft G in Sponge, Rouge, or Measure, without the hard D sound of Judge or George.

Jaro, *year*; ĝojo, *joy*; ja, *indeed*; jam, *already*; jaketo, *jacket*; jeti, *to throw*; ĵurnalo, *newspaper*.

There is no word for a or an; Ganto means *glove* or a *glove*; De, *of*; En, *in*; Kun, *with*; Nun, *now*; Ne, *no* or *not*; Pro, *for*; Tro, *too*.

A noun, such as *ĝojo*, can be made an adjective, *ĝoja*, or an adverb, *ĝoje*, or verb, *ĝoji*, *to rejoice*, or reversed, *malĝoji*, *sadness*, *mi malĝojis*, *I was sad*; and so on.

To return to verbs; we have seen the infinitive, *Veni*; imperative, *Venu*; present and past, *Venas* and *Venis*; we now have:—

The Future.

Mi venos, *I shall come*.
 ti venos, *thou wilt come*.
 li venos, *he will come*.
 ŝi venos, *she will come*.
 ni venos, *we will come*.
 vi venos, *you will come*.
 ili venos, *they will come*.

The Conditional.

mj venus, *I should or would come*.
 ĉi venus, *thou should'st or would'st come*.

And so on.

NOTE.—As Esperanto is intended for intercourse with foreigners, the second person, singular, *ci* (*tsee*), though seldom used in England, might well be used in Esperanto by parents and teachers to children, and by children and comrades among themselves, or abroad, in anticipation of world-wide camaraderie.

The plural in Esperanto is formed by adding *J* (pronounced as if it were a Y) to nouns and the adjectives or pronouns relating to them.

Nova ganto, *a new glove*.
 Novaj gantoj, *new gloves*.

EXERCISE.

La graso knabo kuras en la granda ĝardeno, kun la malgrandaj nevinjoj. La jaro estas ja tre longa. Frato! ĉi estas ja tre bona! La jaketo de la knabino estas jam tro malgranda por ŝi. La nova ĵuraloj estas pli plenaj ol la malnovaj, sed pli malveraj. La novaj gantoj de la fratino estas jam malpuraj. La patrinino ne venas kaj mi malĝojas. La onklino maljunas, ĝi estas malĝoja.

(To be continued.)

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor... Workers' Dreadnought, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Subscription table with columns for duration (Three Months, Six Months, One Year) and price (Post Free 3/3, 8/6, 13/-).

Vol. VIII. No. 39. Saturday, Dec. 10, 1921.

THE THOMAS LIBEL CASE.

The Thomas Libel Action provided a great opportunity for propaganda against reactionary leaders like Thomas and Hodges, and for a more advanced and revolutionary industrial policy.

That opportunity was largely missed. Justice Darling and Thomas himself inadvertently made, the one by his comments, the other by his admissions, the best propaganda, from the Communist point of view.

It is a thousand pities that persons who assume the responsibilities of editors and propagandists of the Communist movement, when they are faced with the consequences of their activities should fly to King's Counsels to defend them.

A Communist propagandist must be a poor propagandist, indeed, if he cannot put his case better than any lawyer, who is without sympathy for Communism, and without experience of the working class movement.

The Thomas case involved no intricate technicalities of law, such as a lawyer would have a special advantage in handling; it required, however, an intimate knowledge of the Communist and Labour movements.

Justice Darling performed a useful service in the interests of clean working-class leadership in expressing the view that a man ought not to occupy the dual position of Privy Councillor and Trade Union official.

J. H. Thomas, anxious to cling to both offices, and snobbishly prizing the Privy Councillorship, strove to justify his position, by stating that he had always found the King "impartial" on Labour questions.

He admitted that he publicly criticised in the House of Commons the Miners' decision to keep out the pump-men and safety-men, and that he made a suggestion about this which led Mr. Austen Chamberlain behind the Speaker's chair, and that he also spoke with the Prime Minister behind the Speaker's chair, about the pump-men.

He admitted that he wanted to avoid a Triple Alliance strike if possible, and was relieved when the opportunity to prevent it arose.

He admitted that he had considered the question of resigning, because, as he stated during the dispute, it was challenging the whole constitutional system, but he remained "to guide it on right lines," and he thought everything he did in connection with the dispute was quite consistent with his membership of the Privy Council.

Verdict a Foregone Conclusion. The verdict was, of course, a foregone conclusion. All the class prejudices of judge and jury were aroused against the Communists, and Justice Darling constantly interjected observations which displayed his detestation, not merely of Communism, but also of ordinary Trade Unionism.

Of course, we consider, as before, that Thomas betrayed the Miners and the Labour Cause. He induced the Miners to give up their strongest weapon—the refusal to allow the pump-men and safety-men to go down—in the hope of Triple Alliance support, and all the time he was looking and hoping for every opportunity to avoid Triple Alliance support being given. Those who seek such opportunities are not slow to find them.

Hodges. As to Frank Hodges; he disgraced himself by saying that the withdrawal of the pump-men was bad tactics. The M.F.G.B. allows a surprising degree of latitude to its secretary.

Thomas Admitted. The admissions of Thomas, in the witness box, should prove very damaging to his reputation in the Labour movement. We predict they will do more to turn the rank and file against him than anything said of him by others. He admitted:—

That he is not a Socialist, Yet the Labour Party has now adopted a Socialist Reformist programme and is affiliated to the Second International, which still professes to be a Socialist organisation. How does Thomas reconcile his position in the Labour Party and the Second International since he is not a Socialist?

What will the Second International say to Mr. Thomas's statement that he is not a Socialist?

Why was not Ablett Called?

The opportunity of exposing the old Trade Union was largely thrown away. Robert Williams and other officials of the Triple Alliance and Transport Workers' Federation, ought to have been called and closely examined as to their activities and connection with Thomas.

Every member of the Miners' Federation Executive ought to have been called and, under the searchlight of examination in the witness box, new facts discovered and sifted.

Herbert Smith, who said: "Get on the Field," ought to have been called.

Noah Ablett, the one man who had the courage to protest against the betrayal of the men in the pits, by their leaders, and to reveal the discreditable affair of the "Chequers," ought to have been put into the box to tell all he knew.

Thomas ought to have been more thoroughly cross-examined as to his own relationship with the railway directors and the coal owners. Those who are in the know, have startling things to say about the connection between certain well-known Labour officials and associations of employers.

How far Thomas can show a clean sheet in this direction is a question that ought to have been deeply probed.

Let us hope that a better fighting case will be put up on a subsequent occasion.

Justice Darling Says A Man Should Not Be Both Privy Councillor and Trade Union Official.

Justice Darling performed a useful service in the interests of clean working-class leadership in expressing the view that a man ought not to occupy the dual position of Privy Councillor and Trade Union official.

J. H. Thomas, anxious to cling to both offices, and snobbishly prizing the Privy Councillorship, strove to justify his position, by stating that he had always found the King "impartial" on Labour questions.

He admitted that he publicly criticised in the House of Commons the Miners' decision to keep out the pump-men and safety-men, and that he made a suggestion about this which led Mr. Austen Chamberlain behind the Speaker's chair, and that he also spoke with the Prime Minister behind the Speaker's chair, about the pump-men.

He admitted that he wanted to avoid a Triple Alliance strike if possible, and was relieved when the opportunity to prevent it arose.

He admitted that he had considered the question of resigning, because, as he stated during the dispute, it was challenging the whole constitutional system, but he remained "to guide it on right lines," and he thought everything he did in connection with the dispute was quite consistent with his membership of the Privy Council.

Verdict a Foregone Conclusion. The verdict was, of course, a foregone conclusion. All the class prejudices of judge and jury were aroused against the Communists, and Justice Darling constantly interjected observations which displayed his detestation, not merely of Communism, but also of ordinary Trade Unionism.

Of course, we consider, as before, that Thomas betrayed the Miners and the Labour Cause. He induced the Miners to give up their strongest weapon—the refusal to allow the pump-men and safety-men to go down—in the hope of Triple Alliance support, and all the time he was looking and hoping for every opportunity to avoid Triple Alliance support being given. Those who seek such opportunities are not slow to find them.

Hodges. As to Frank Hodges; he disgraced himself by saying that the withdrawal of the pump-men was bad tactics. The M.F.G.B. allows a surprising degree of latitude to its secretary.

Thomas Admitted. The admissions of Thomas, in the witness box, should prove very damaging to his reputation in the Labour movement. We predict they will do more to turn the rank and file against him than anything said of him by others. He admitted:—

That he is not a Socialist, Yet the Labour Party has now adopted a Socialist Reformist programme and is affiliated to the Second International, which still professes to be a Socialist organisation. How does Thomas reconcile his position in the Labour Party and the Second International since he is not a Socialist?

What will the Second International say to Mr. Thomas's statement that he is not a Socialist?

Will it ask for his expulsion from the Labour Party, as a condition of its continued affiliation?

Asked:— "You would not hesitate to use all your efforts to defeat Communism?" He answered:—

"No hesitation whatever. I would be serving my own Cause and the workers', by defeating Communism."

He added:— "I was conscious of the fact that I could serve the Community and betray the Communists."

He admitted that he does not approve of the National Pool, though he said he approved it as first explained; he admitted he criticised it to the Railwaymen, in discussing the question of striking.

He admitted that during the strike he was working against revolution, or even a "national upheaval," and that he would always strive to defeat any movement towards Revolution. He said: "I kept the oath of allegiance to his Majesty, which is binding on all."

So Thomas does not go as far, in theory, as the old-fashioned Radical Republican.

He admitted that he publicly criticised in the House of Commons the Miners' decision to keep out the pump-men and safety-men, and that he made a suggestion about this which led Mr. Austen Chamberlain behind the Speaker's chair, and that he also spoke with the Prime Minister behind the Speaker's chair, about the pump-men.

He admitted that he wanted to avoid a Triple Alliance strike if possible, and was relieved when the opportunity to prevent it arose.

He admitted that he had considered the question of resigning, because, as he stated during the dispute, it was challenging the whole constitutional system, but he remained "to guide it on right lines," and he thought everything he did in connection with the dispute was quite consistent with his membership of the Privy Council.

Verdict a Foregone Conclusion. The verdict was, of course, a foregone conclusion. All the class prejudices of judge and jury were aroused against the Communists, and Justice Darling constantly interjected observations which displayed his detestation, not merely of Communism, but also of ordinary Trade Unionism.

Of course, we consider, as before, that Thomas betrayed the Miners and the Labour Cause. He induced the Miners to give up their strongest weapon—the refusal to allow the pump-men and safety-men to go down—in the hope of Triple Alliance support, and all the time he was looking and hoping for every opportunity to avoid Triple Alliance support being given. Those who seek such opportunities are not slow to find them.

Hodges. As to Frank Hodges; he disgraced himself by saying that the withdrawal of the pump-men was bad tactics. The M.F.G.B. allows a surprising degree of latitude to its secretary.

Thomas Admitted. The admissions of Thomas, in the witness box, should prove very damaging to his reputation in the Labour movement. We predict they will do more to turn the rank and file against him than anything said of him by others. He admitted:—

That he is not a Socialist, Yet the Labour Party has now adopted a Socialist Reformist programme and is affiliated to the Second International, which still professes to be a Socialist organisation. How does Thomas reconcile his position in the Labour Party and the Second International since he is not a Socialist?

What will the Second International say to Mr. Thomas's statement that he is not a Socialist?

COMMUNISM AND ITS TACTICS.

In Russia all this was done, and over vast districts, under the spur of need without preliminary thought or organisation.

In this country the workers cannot leave things to chance. Capitalism is highly organised here and will defeat the workers' revolution again and again, unless the workers are organised efficiently.

Moreover, in London and in the vast chains of towns which form our industrial districts we are so closely massed on the ground, so absolutely dependent on food brought in from outside, and upon the collective service of the whole industrial community, that unless production and distribution is well organised we must speedily starve.

It will go hard with us if we have not created the machinery before the hour of revolution strikes.

The machinery of the Soviets must obviously follow, and does so far as it is successful, the lines of need. Each workshop has its meetings and elects its delegates to a factory committee.

The factory will also have its mass meetings of all workers on occasion. Every factory will be united to the factories of the same industry in the district through its committee of delegates, and in the same way will be co-ordinated with every factory in the same industry in the country.

These are the bodies which will meet and discuss what concerns the industry, but for matters which concern the district in which the workers live and work they will go to mass meetings or send delegates to committees from all the industries in the district.

The housekeepers will have their own meetings also, and they, too, will go to mass meetings or send delegates to the producing industries when arrangements are to be made between them.

All this will be done purely by way of managing affairs so that all may be, as far as possible, satisfied, that the needs of all may be explained and understood by those who have to supply them.

But there should be no compulsion; some people may say: "What the majority decide is good enough for me." Others will say: "I like to have a voice in it." As a rule, when things affecting a group of people who are working together come up for decision everyone of the group will join in and give his or her opinion, and generally the thing will be decided by mutual agreement.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a much misused phrase; when Communism is in being there will be no proletariat, as we understand the term to-day, and no dictatorship.

The dictatorship, so far as it is genuine and defensible, is the suppression by Workers' Soviets of capitalism and the attempt to re-establish it. This should be a temporary state of war. Such a period will inevitably occur, we believe, because we do not believe that the possessors of wealth will submit to the overthrow of capitalism without resistance.

On the contrary, believe the owners will fight to preserve capitalism by every means in their power.

Whilst the capitalists are openly fighting the workers who have seized the power, fighting them openly and secretly in armed battalions in guerilla bands, by ambush assassination bombs, sabotage, spies; then the proletariat must maintain a vigilant war Ireland and dictatorship. The situation in Ireland before the truce is a little like what a proletarian dictatorship may have to cope with.

Once, however, the war is over, once the capitalist and his allies have given up any serious attempt to re-establish capitalism, then away with dictatorship; away with compulsion.

Compulsion of any kind is repugnant to the Communist ideal. No one may make a wage slave of another; no one may hoard up goods for himself that he does not require and cannot use; but the only way to

prevent such practices is not by making them punishable; it is by creating a society in which no one needs to become a wage slave, and no one cares to be cumbered with a private hoard of goods when all that he needs is readily supplied as he needs it from the common storehouse.

Compulsory education for children has been a protection for children in this capitalist society when parents are poor and grasping enough to desire the earnings of their children or to suffer from the burden of their maintenance, but when all things that nature and mankind produce are free in abundance for the asking what parents would deny education to their children; what children would submit with the school-door freely open?

The old burdens, anxieties and misde-meansours of capitalism will have no place under Communism. We must learn to see life from a new angle if we would comprehend, even dimly, what the great change will mean.

Dictating, bossing, interfering with the liberty of others; why should people seek to do it if they gain nothing for themselves thereby?

The normal human being works best with freedom to develop initiative and without financial care and anxiety as to the permanence of the job. Thus the mind may be concentrated on the business in hand, and a genuine pleasure in the work is developed. We are almost all normal human beings borne down by conditions that make us slaves.

To be continued.

THE PRESS AND ART O'BRIEN. The following is the text of a letter delivered at the Home Office from Mr. Art O'Brien, dealing with the unnecessary introduction of his name in a statement given out by officials at Scotland Yard.

24th November, 1921. The Rt. Hon. Edward Shortt, Esq., K.C., M.P., The Home Office, Whitehall.

Dear Sir,—Allow me to call your attention to the fact that yesterday your officials at Scotland Yard were giving out to the press a statement in connection with the raid for arms at Windsor and Chelsea Barracks, and the concluding paragraph of this statement was to the effect that—

"an arrest had been made at a house rented, it is understood, by a prominent member of the Roger Casement Sinn Féin Club, of which Mr. Art O'Brien is President."

This statement was read out to press representatives from a typewritten document by Capt. Bodilly. It is clear, therefore, that both the wording and the purpose of the statement are deliberate.

The issue of this statement resulted in my being approached continuously throughout the day by scores of press reporters, asking if I could give them information with regard to the raids, the arrests, etc.

What, I may ask, is the purpose for introducing my name into such a statement full of innuendo? The only purpose I can discern to have arisen in the distorted imagination of someone is a desire to create prejudice against me amongst the more ignorant of your people, and thus, in some way, to place an obstacle to the negotiations at present proceeding between your Government and mine.

The organs of the London press, with a couple of notable exceptions with which I am dealing, whilst reproducing the rest of the statement, have, with a better sense of decency and fitness than your officials displayed, omitted the seemingly purposeless mention of my name.

In my turn, I am taking the opportunity of sending a copy of this letter to the press, to which I sign, in the circumstances, you will not object.

Yours faithfully, (Signed) ART O'BRIEN.

A LETTER FROM ODESSA. Extracts from two letters sent by a Comrade (Harry Jimack) in Odessa, Russia, to his sister in England.

I am writing this letter in the library, which is attached to our factory. I can hear the dull murmur of the machinery working, and the sound of hammers. Every blow of the hammer is a blow for the revolution; such is the gist of one of the placards that are pasted all over our young Socialist State. And in that is the essence of our inner policy: to work, to increase production, this will save Russia and the revolution.

Two days ago I heard Trotsky. . . . He spoke of Rumania: "We shall not fight for Bessarabia," he said, "but if Rumania starts, then the boundary will be further than it is at present." Poland will

By SYLVIA PANKHURST.

not fight again. Rumania may, but he does not think so. But throughout the whole world it can be seen that we are prepared for any and everything. Our very demobilisation shows that we are not afraid.

Another enemy of ours is hunger. But even against that steps have been taken, which show that Russia will live through it all. We welcome help from outside, but if it is not given we can tighten our belts and manage ourselves.

I have now been in Odessa, with two or three breaks, for four years, and there have been, in that short time, about fifteen changes of power, much street-fighting, and bombardment from the sea. I came when Krensky was the boss. After him, generally with fighting, came the Reds (Communists), then the Ukrainians (Petlura's crowd), Reds again, then the Germans, then the French, then the English, then Ukrainians, then Poles, then French, English, Reds, Whites, Reds, and it has been led ever since! Life has been very eventful, and interesting.

You tell me that many coming back from Russia to England have not been quite truthful. I do not know what they say, but you must take them psychologically. Perhaps their own economic position was very bad, therefore, according to them, the revolution was a failure.

Often in England have I, with other Comrades, shouted, "Long live the Social Revolution"; we have hurrahed until we were hoarse. But we, or at least I, did not know what revolution meant. Do not think that a revolution is easy to make; it is a thing of blood and iron. The capitalists of the world will not give away their riches, land, their all, just because we, the workers of the world, want them. We have got to take them, even if we have to use steel, machine guns, bombs. Only through power can we make our revolution, and only with power can we keep hold of what we have gained.

Russia is not an idealistic Socialist State. Neither is it a land of despotism and militarism. Our enemies shout that we are militaristic; yes, they have felt the weight of our Red Army. They wish we had no army. We are demobilising all men from 27 and upwards. All between 18 and 27 still have to serve. It would be foolhardy to demobilise all, with Rumania and Poland looking at us with hungry eyes, and the hopes of the counter-revolutionaries are still very big, thinking of the famine, and working for revolts all over Russia.

We have still existing our much derided Chnesvichanka (Extraordinary Commission). The necessity for it has been proved again and again. It is our revolutionary tribunal, and it does its work well. Only last week in Petrograd it discovered an underground counter-revolutionary organisation, and two weeks ago similar organisations were discovered in Kiev and Odessa. These latter were working in harmony with secret agents from Rumania. When such a discovery is made, what shall we do with their members but shoot them? Loving your enemies is all very well, but shooting them when they are trying their utmost to shoot you is a better policy. Our Extraordinary Commission is an organisation we cannot do without, and without it the revolution would fall, even the so far invincible Red Army would be powerless.

Russia has emerged from that phase of "Communism" necessitated by the war—civil and against Russia, and she is gradually going to State Capitalism, but managed by Communists.

Do not forget that 90 per cent. of Russia's population are peasants; these want manufactured goods, of which Russia has so little, in return for land products. The peasantry are certainly right; Russia cannot have Communism until she can satisfy the peasant. In war-time she took every thing from him. In peace-time she cannot. Therefore Russia has to increase production. She needs coal, machines, railways, raw materials, and a host of things of which she has none or very little. How is she to do it? She has decided to allow small traders to exist. She is allowing private enterprises. . . . Of course, Russia is doing her best, at the same time, to increase foreign trading, which perhaps is the chief thing, for then she can import all the fuel and machinery that is necessary for her railways and factories.

The following letter has been sent to the Editor of the Daily Herald:—

Sir,—In the Herald of 23rd instant you publish a criticism of Miss Sylvia Pankhurst's book "Soviet Russia as I Saw It." Much could be said of the criticism of the book, but what I wish to deal with is the following remark:—

" . . . has turned like a capricious child to spit at the gigantic revolution . . ."

I protest against the misrepresentation of Miss Pankhurst. She is heart and soul in the movement; the Russian revolution is understood by her and appreciated to its fullest value, especially what it will mean in history, it being the most important event that has ever happened.

As regards her attacking the revolution, that again is a misrepresentation. What she has done has been to put forward the facts of the going back on the revolution, and, in my opinion, she is right on the international standpoint; we must have this knowledge so that we may learn from their failures as much as we have learned from their successes, so that when the day comes here we shall avoid such mistakes.

I hope you will find room in your columns for this letter, as I feel that such misrepresentations of Miss Sylvia Pankhurst and her work in the movement should not be allowed to pass unchallenged.

Yours faithfully, (Signed) (Mrs.) S. CAHILL.

THE COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY.

Fundamental Ideas for the Communist Workers' International. Its Historic Aim and Development, Its Tactics and Form of Organisation.

The revolutionary proletariat of the whole world is to-day engaged in the struggle against the always-more-firmly-uniting international bourgeoisie, without possessing an international fighting organisation that will represent, determinedly and unbendingly, the interests of the proletarian revolution.

The new Communist Workers' International will have to set up as its object the firm principle creating the proletarian-Communist epoch, and, as the first step in that direction, the annihilation of capitalist State powers and the erection of proletarian Soviet States.

This goal requires the burning of the boats that would lead back to the bourgeoisie and its State, that is to say, it requires the openly revolutionary attitude in the course and conduct of the entire campaign.

The supreme guiding principle—the Communist Workers' International—must not be the special interest of any "national," or West

European revolution, but the common interest of the world proletariat: the world revolution.

In deciding upon its tactics, it must must, on the one hand, avoid any cut-and-dried schemes; but, on the other hand, lay down such methods of fighting as are required by the needs of the proletarian revolution itself. It will have to take as starting-point the degree of economic development in the various countries, and will have to fight everywhere where the death-struggle of Capitalism has set in, with exclusively proletarian-revolutionary weapons; that is to say, with anti-Parliamentarian, anti-Trade Union and generally speaking, with anti-legal methods.

The fighting methods of the Communist Workers' Party of Germany arise from the advanced degree of economic development of Germany. In all capitalist countries, the proletariat—Capitalism should enter this phase—will be obliged to have recourse to similar weapons. That is proved particularly by the most significant, though matter-of-course, fact that the development towards the forms of tactics and organisation of the C.W.P.G. is now first of all taking place in those countries that have already before been intimately associated with the policy of the

"OUR JIM."

By A. Siffleet.

The Trade Union Conference had adjourned for lunch; and in a neighbouring Café, around small marble tables, crowded the delegates, excitedly discussing, through clouds of tobacco smoke, the morning's business.

The Conference had provided several "incidents." One leader had been refused a hearing; whilst two others had received yells of "traitor." These men were leaders of long standing, who had, however, at last proved, in the words of a delegate, "more than we can — well stomach."

At one table in particular, these "traitors" were the theme of heated discussion. Could they, or could they not, be nipped in the bud? Were they abnormally stupid? And even when these "traitors" were detected, how could their spell on the masses be broken?

And so the battle raged. Said one: "I fear that these men will always impose themselves upon the movement. They must be tried, given time to expose themselves, and when found wanting, kicked out. There's no other way."

"Nonsense!" said another, "I say that most men of this type are transparent scamps, and have it plainly written on their faces. I cannot conceive how they impose on you five minutes."

Whilst yet another imagined that the workers' struggle would continue to throw up weaklings and renegades to the end of the piece, and despite the waste of effort, loss of time, and disheartenment, this was unavoidable.

"What about Perkins?" asked one. All eyes turned on Perkins, a diminutive, weary-looking little chap, who, in his large, tortoise-shell spectacles, strongly resembled a cockroach. "Yes, what does Perkins think?" they all cried. For Perkins knew nothing of politics; he had attended merely as a visitor. His view would at least be impartial.

And Perkins, his head gravely on one side, and with a pained expression, delivered himself as follows:

"Gentlemen, as a visitor, you embarrass me. This question is so comical—and pathetic. For you, who have studied men in the mass, have totally ignored them individually. You cannot see the tree for the woods. Here are a few men who, according to you, have been before you years, have lined their pockets and played you double; have, with a few stage gestures and little intelligence, acquired and held place among you, and who, even now, are only in process-of being found out. You are too clever, that's the trouble. You have abandoned those natural instincts that tell one that his neighbour is trusty or treacherous, courageous or cowardly, generous

or mean. These simple instincts alone should warn you against the enemies within the camp.

"Now, I am not conversant with your leaders, but let me describe one who, although greeted with tremendous applause, impressed me immediately unpleasantly.

"He sat, I think, fourth from the Chair, his head cocked to one side, with a supercilious expression. He fidgetted, continuously, with self-importance. These items probably escaped you; but they struck me at once. Here is a man, I said, shallow, conceited, itching to launch a few premeditated phrases to the accompaniment of a little acting. He eyed the audience with assurance, as though he knew their love of the vivid phrase, their suggestibility, their hatred of reason and analysis, their utter helplessness in the hands of a bold and ready speaker. He even grinned to himself occasionally, as if with satisfaction at being able to dupe them so easily.

"I was not surprised then, when his turn came to speak, to see him rise and approach the Chair, not in a manly, upright fashion, but with a kind of crouch, and with apeish strides (and there's a lot in a man's walk) gain the centre of the platform, where he stood in a melodramatic fighting attitude, his left side toward the audience. He spoke in a rasping voice, a speech that consisted of three phrases, juggled as a conjurer might juggle with three balls. The three phrases were: 'In my 'umble judgment'; 'I ave no 'esitation in sayin';' and 'A doo sense of my responsibility.'

"I could scarce tolerate his clap-trap in silence. I wanted to rise, to shout at him, to tell him that even if he did imagine he was addressing a gathering of children (as by his impudent intonation was plain), he could leave me out of the reckoning. And yet it was a pleasure to watch him; he was such a finished rogue.

"Ha! Ha! Once he stopped, and regarded the audience with such a cunning look, as if he were meditating some trick, as if he was making a move, and was merely choosing his moment. Suddenly he commenced striding the platform, pounding the air with his fists (fists well-used to hitting nothing), raising his voice to an agonised howl, denouncing the enemies of Labour. How they cheered. Then, in a second, he changed his tone, and with forefinger extended, he shook his hand at the delegates, warning them, seriously, piteously, with 'a doo sense of responsibility,' his voice quavering (for he had practised it well), his eyes filling with tears, as he pleaded for orderly, constitutional, evolutionary methods. 'I love your Cause,' he whined, glancing through his tears at the Pressmen, to see if their pencils were busy.

"Better play-acting I have never seen. And how they cheered! Just a few seemed to have their doubts; and some groaned. Yet the knavery was palpable. You gentlemen must learn to interpret the stray glance, the unconsidered word,

MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

German bourgeois State, and through the latter's, or respectively, their own defeat in the World War, are being forced into a similar economic and political position: these countries are Austria, Bulgaria, German Switzerland, Holland, Luxembourg, Spain, Mexico and the Argentine.

In all these countries the Communist Workers' groups are approaching the standpoint of the C.W.P.G., or have not quite reached it, because the development of the economic conditions of their country is not yet as far advanced as that of Germany. Therefore it would be utterly wrong to forestall the historic development by a superficial precept. Things will have to develop. The tactics of the C.W.P.G. will ultimately lead the proletariat to victory.

A similar consideration to that applying to the rules of tactics in the various countries must be taken into account when deciding upon the form of organisation for the Communist Workers' International. Nobody is able to give us the Communist Workers' International as a ready-made organisation. It must grow originally by degrees, just as the C.W.P.G. has developed organically. Its organisation cannot be dictated from above; it must be created from down below.

and the unguarded action. To the discerning eye there is nothing so trivial or insignificant, but that it is symptomatic of the real man." "But who was this man?" asked a delegate. "Why! Look! Quick!" cried Perkins. "There he goes!" "What . . . what . . . him?" growled the delegates, indignantly, "why, that's our Jim!"

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.

By TOM ANDERSON.

In the Sunday Chronicle of Sunday, 26 November, 1921, "Plain Dealer" makes a gentle attack on the Proletarian Schools by gathering all the mud that surrounds Manchester and throwing it at us. Tom Anderson is called a low, dirty, vicious, cunning Bolshevik who wants to abolish the Hebrew God and install Haha, and Haha, only into the pockets of the children of the working class, so that when their time comes of entering the factory these little rebels will steal it. Could anything lie so diabolical as this? Is it worse a thousand times than being a Parliamentary Communist. What will we do with him. "Pay him off." Impossible, he has not got a haire. Well, take the schools from him, discredit him in the eyes of the working class. Good. The Sunday Chronicle to the attack. The Socialist has had a try. And our brave, bad mud Communist says it can be done. Just leave it to him. He can come the stunt, "Proper education, etc." See by "John Bull," a Christian paper of Merrie England, has had several tries. And the great "House of Commons," the place where all the by men meet, have asked the Home Secretary to intervene. Poor Mr. Shortt says, give me time. Our Scottish Secretary (Mr. Munro) says, I will look after them; I will get them put under the wing of a Parliamentary Party. Just give us time, and so the drama proceeds. My good Christian friends of Britain, don't get afraid. You don't believe in the Hebrew God yourselves, why then trouble. Oh! oh! "Henry," do you hear them; they are appealing to your superstition.

Lady Griffith-Boscawen. Can a lady lie, a beautiful lady, a titled lady, a lady that believes in God and his Son Jesus, a lady that has been baptised, a lady that has a life of leisure, a lady that all we poor people admire. Yes, a lady can lie. It is sad yet true, that our beautiful lady, Lady Griffith-Boscawen, has written an article in the Weekly Despatch of Sunday, 4th December, 1921, "On Red Sunday Schools." My dear lady, there is not one word of truth in your article. I have written my lady privately, and told her so, and also the editor of the Weekly Despatch. My lady gives in her article a catechism making little of God, Jesus and the Virgin Mary, and religion in general. And she says we teach it in our schools. It is a lie! Repeat it, Comrade Printer. It is a lie! A low, cunning, dirty lie, to appeal to the superstition of the backward masses. We never had seen the catechism until it was issued by the Unions Association of Glasgow as an election stunt during the municipal elections of 1920. Could a lie be lower than this. I don't think so, and coming from a beautiful lady; for you must remember her ladyship is good-looking. It is awful, my dear lady. Now, will you answer that lie when you appear before the "Judgment Seat." If I am there before you, I will say on your behalf that it was to save your class. You told the lie. Then let it be known to all the workers of England that a beautiful lady told a lie. We ask the workers of England to pray for her ladyship.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

On December 20th the ninth All-Russian Soviet Congress will be held in Moscow. The republics of Azerbaijan, Armenia, White Russia, Bokhara, Georgia, Khurasan, Kazanie, and the Republic of the Far East are invited to send delegates.

France v. Russia. In reply to Briand's statement that France will exercise pressure upon Soviet Russia till all foreign debts are recognised, Rosta says: "That the Allies have little to blow up a thousand Russian bridges and destroy a number of cities and hundreds of thousands of lives."

At the same time the French Government is not in a position to establish exactly what debt claims it has against Soviet Russia. The French Government has spent one milliard two hundred million francs in creating the Polish Army to attack Soviet Russia. The Chief of the French military mission in Warsaw says the Polish Army will be the strongest in the world.

Russia v. Norway. A Norwegian Consul is about to arrive in Archangel.

India. Between 1914 and 1919 the number of agricultural wage workers of India rose from 17 to 37 million. This means that the peasants have been losing their land. The number of the industrial workers also rose by 54 per cent. The native bourgeoisie have become richer, the foreign capitalist has become poorer. Look to these causes for the reason of the Afghan rebellions and the growth of Indian Sinn Féin.

India, on a report from Smitz, Russian Extraordinary delegate in Central Asia, says:—

"The direction of the trade unions is still in the hands of the compromising intellectuals, but in spite of that the movement of the proletariat in India is very revolutionary and every strike leads to bloody clashes. The leaders of the national movement are being forced by the pressure of the masses to permit more radical measures in the struggle."

"The national movement, which is formally led by leaders who are united in the all-Indian National Congress, has recently developed very greatly. This congress unites political and social groups who are united by common economic nor common political program. Its Left Wing, which demands the complete independence of India, consists chiefly of representatives from Bengal, that district of India which has the greatest industry."

The Khilafat movement began in connection with the partition of Turkey and the occupation of Constantinople by the Entente, and constitutes a great danger for English policy in the lands of the Middle and Near East. "A combined struggle is being carried on by the English against the revolutionary movement in India. At the same time as they apply the most repressive measures, they endeavour to support themselves upon some circles of the bourgeois and the landowners. "Counter-revolutionary leagues are created, which round one of the Italian Fascists in their methods of warfare. But even the alliance with the reactionary portion of the Indian bourgeoisie carries the danger of the economic expulsion of the English."

Poland v. Russia. Trotsky says Soviet Russia must still make munitions, because Poland still wobbles between peace and war.

Why go back to Private Capitalism? Last year the Soviet Supreme Council of Public Economy, reports a continued slow progress in Russia's industrial production; if the present slow rate of increase continues Russia will be back to her pre-war production in 1927. There does not seem to have been any marked acceleration of the rate of increase since the recent extensive concessions to capitalism were made. What benefit can come of them to compensate to the workers' loss?

In the first half of 1921 the production was 25 per cent. above the previous 6 months; in the second half-year the increase was at the rate of 15 per cent. So that since the new economic policy the rate of increase has been smaller in value than greater.

Russia's New Economic Policy.

Ekonomicheskaja Schin says the transition to commercialism is proceeding rapidly. On October 22nd 2,292 mills and 1,008 dairies had been leased, and a smaller number of meat curing establishments. "The transition of the individual business," says the same paper, "to a commercial concern is favoured by the circumstance that in this branch of industry, which is in immediate touch with a large number of consumers, capital is turned over very rapidly." In Moscow the same paper explains: "all the large State concerns are turned over to private enterprise." What becomes of the story that it is only the little pettyfoggish enterprises that go over to capitalism? The same Soviet Government economic organ above-mentioned continues:—

"We were not content, however, to merely place upon the new economic basis. The Central Commission for Agricultural Production began also to unite the concerns into trusts. A special committee was formed in the Commission, which had to prepare a program for the formation of trusts. So far the project has been approved of to organise a trust of tea and coffee concerns and a project for a trust of starch and spirits concerns prepared. A project for an alcohol trust is also being made. In the Central Commission a special trade bureau

is being set up which will deal with the purchase and sale for the trusts." A company of Norwegian capitalists has been leased a forest concession in the province of Olonetz. A sawmill, a paper factory, and a cellulose factory will be erected there.

Money and Banking in Soviet Russia. In every direction the reversion to the old order is swift. The Soviet Government has set up a scale of charges for sending money by post and telegraph. The Commissariat for Foreign Affairs announces it to foreign capitalist interests its arrangements for banking.

The socialisation of industry, the abolition of private trade, food on ration or as wages were crowding money out of circulation.

The New Economic Policy. Soviet Russia's new economic policy began March, 1921. On June 13th, 1921, followed a consequent new financial policy. A decree of that date permitted current banking accounts, new taxes and the re-introduction of payment for railways, post, telegraph followed.

On 18th November, 1921, the State Bank was opened.

Private Enterprise—Leases in Moscow. Ekonomicheskaja Schin, of November 2nd, publishes a table of the factories which have been leased in Moscow:—

Table with 3 columns: Industry, Up to October 14th, Up to October 31st. Rows include Metal, Furniture, Chemical, Woodworking, Printing, Leather, Bakeries, and Total.

GERMANY. The Political and Economic Position.

By our Special Correspondent.

The German Government now recognises the K.A.P.D. (Communist Workers' Party) and A.A.U. (General Workers' Union) as the only truly revolutionary danger. Last Friday the police confiscated the "Communist Workers' Paper" and the "Kampfruf" (Battle Cry), the official organ of the A.A.U. These two papers had the audacity to put on their front pages an appeal to the proletariat, saying:—

"Are you madmen? Is the game to continue? Do you wish slowly to perish like dogs? We declare to do so! . . . Our enemy is private property—our class-god is the proletarian commonwealth. There is no other way than the struggle for power! Demolish everything that stand in your way! Drive your parliamentary monkeys out of the temple of the bourgeoisie, break all alliances with the bourgeoisie! Denial the Trade Unions, the bourgeois State and the democratic penal republic. Break through the law of capitalist private property! Unite in the factories and workshops by means of Revolutionary Executive Committees! Create the united front of the proletarian class in the fight for political power! Establish the Soviet State of the revolutionary proletariat. Act in accordance with the law of proletarian common property! It is a struggle for life and death! The end of private property is the death of the bourgeoisie! The death of the bourgeoisie is the life of the proletariat! Up to the last fight! Communists to the front! Long live the dictatorship of the proletariat! Long live the world-revolution! Communist Workers' Party of Germany. General Workers' Union. Young Communist Workers' Executive. Council of the Unemployed.

The political situation here appeared very critical to superficial observers until a few days ago; but true revolutionaries entertained from the outset little hope of a general strike. There were, of course, some very significant reasons for the proletariat to rise in rebellion against the ruling class; but the leaders of the Social Democrats and Trade Unions, through their representatives in the Government, have known how to nip every revolutionary attempt in the bud.

First of all a great storm of proletarian indignation was roused for a few days against the inquisitorial treatment of political prisoners in several penitentiaries, such as Lichtenburg, Torgau, Tegel. Their physical ill-treatment had caused those prisoners to enter into a hunger-strike, and all stood solidly together, as they foolishly believed that the K.P.D. Reichstag fraction (the Communist members of Parliament) would succeed in getting them and all other political prisoners released by means of a political amnesty. But the great K.P.D. Party with its 400,000 members and numerous members of Parliament collapsed, as usual, quite hopelessly. With

the aid of the Social Democratic Cabinet Ministers, the Minister of Justice, instead of instituting an inquiry, and in the meantime releasing the proletarian victims, ordered the most rebellious of them to be removed to other prisons and placed them in solitary confinement. The consequences was that the backbone of the hunger-strike was broken, and all remained as it was. The torture, persecution and tantalising of the best sons of the revolutionary proletariat continues, even; no doubt, in an aggravated form.

Then there were the riots of the unemployed, who in order to emphasise their hopeless position, had struck against taking work at the Labour Exchange. The result was repression and persecution by the municipal authorities through the Military Police. The unemployed retaliated by undertaking plunderings of big shops and clearing them of their food-stuff and articles of clothing. The Military Police, being unable to quell these outbreaks by ordinary methods, employed the extraordinary means of surrounding the crowds with armed motor vans and carrying away hundreds of unemployed with one sweep. This radical method en masse naturally broke up the united effort of the unemployed, while, on the other hand, their thirst for vengeance on the powers that owe has greatly increased, and will one day break forth with greater incensity and no doubt more far-reaching success.

The Parliamentary Communists have during the past week also used as their political hobby-horse the, according to them, "threatened return of the State railways." The agitation of the Communist workers-from-within-the-Trade-Unions has made an awful "row" in the Unions, but Stinnes and the Social Democratic Government have taken the wind out of the sails of the Parliamentary Communists by declaring that the State railway system can be restored to its former soundness without handing it over to the control of private capitalists. The Reform-Communist are rejoicing at their great success in preventing "Socialist" property from going back to the hands of private exploiters (Poor railway workers! they have no reason to rejoice, as they cannot see the advantage of State employment.)

Some of the weak-kneed and more gullible elements of the proletariat believed that the demands of the Berlin municipal workers for higher wages in consequence of the enormous rise in prices would lead to a general strike here in Berlin, and later to a sympathy strike throughout the country. But this faint hope has, of course, not been realised.

The Municipal Executive Council, the majority of which are "Socialist," naturally entered immediately into negotiations with the gas and electricity workers, and after the workers having refused the offer of 50 per cent. of their demand, the dispute will be referred to arbitration—and no doubt, a satisfactory decision will be soon arrived at, as in many previous cases!

Viewing Stinnes' visit to London from a revolutionary standpoint, one may assume that he has, in conjunction with Lloyd George, found a way of raising the necessary loans internationally, in order to pay the instalment of the costs of reparation now becoming due, so as to tide "poor broken" Germany over its "awful" crisis. Surely it can only be in the interest of the controlling large international capitalists to support the idea of the German Ebert Government to make all the workers participate in the rebuilding of Germany's "prosperity." The best and briefest way to this end is, indeed, the secret economic supremacy of Stinnes and his clique under the patronage of a "purely Socialist" Government, which will, no doubt, be the next stage of political development.

Only after such a final swindle has been exploded, may we reckon on a revolutionary fight of the united proletariat that will, and must, lead to their conquest of political power and their taking over the entire process of wealth production.

Continued from page 4. The South Wales Miners' Federation has already affiliated to the Red International of Labour Unions, and other sections of the Miners' Federation is likely to follow. Then Hodges ought to go; but will he? The moral of all this is, obviously, that the awakened workers have delayed too long in beginning to built up Revolutionary Unions.

TOLSTOI FOR THE YOUNG. Translated by R. S. TOWNSEND. With 6 Coloured Plates. From WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT OFFICE, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

COMMUNISM AND THE FAMILY. KOLLONTAY'S SPLENDID PAMPHLET. Price - 4d. Tells what everyone wants to know about life under Communism. Strikes a blow at Capitalist Social Conventions. From WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT OFFICE, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

