ONE PENNY.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR GOING TO THE ROOT.

Vol. X. No. 47. February 9th, 1924. WEEKLY.

THE SOLDIER.

Your orthodox historian puts
In foremost rank the soldier thus,
The red-coat bully in his boots,
That hides the march of men from us.

He puts him there in foremost rank,
You wonder at his cap of hair;
You hear his sabre's cursed click,
His spurs are jingling everywhere.

So to! I hate him and his trade;
Who bade us so to cringe and bend,

Tell me what find we to admire
In epaulets and scarlet coats—
In men, because they load and fire,
And know the art of cutting throats?

Ah, gentle, tender lady mine!
The winter wind blows cold and shrill;
Come, fill me one more glass of wine,
And give the silly fools their will.

And what care we for war and wrack,
How Kings and heroes rise and fall?
Look yonder, in his coffin black,
There lies the greatest of men all!

To pluck him down, and keep him up,
Died many million human souls—
'Tis twelve o'clock and time to sup;
Bid Mary heap the fire with coals.

He captured many thousand guns;
He wrote "The Great" before his name;
And dying, only left his sons,
The recollection of his shame?

Though more than half the world was his,
He died without a rood his own;
And borrow'd from his enemies,
Six foot of ground to lie upon.

From "The Chronicle of the Drum"
by William Makepeace Thackeray.

SPICE.

Modified Court Dress. Was it Mrs. Sidney Webb, the originator of the 'Half Circle Club' who organised Labour Ministers to declare for the modified Court Dress?

* * *

Red Flag at the Council. Irish labourers rushed in to break up the Westmeath County Council meeting, because the Councillors reduced the wages of its labourers by 13/- a week. The Civic Guard was called to quiet the disturbance.

* * *

"It cannot be when the root is neglected, that what should spring from it will be well ordered."

Confucius.

* * *

MUSSOLINI ON MACDONALD.

The dictator, Mr. Mussolini declared that the letter of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald to the Indians is significant, and shows that he will not move to the left.

We believe so too!

* * *

"GO TO THE GUARDIANS."

300 unemployed men marched to Carlisle Workhouse and secured admission as inmates.

THE WORLD REVOLUTION.

By Hermann Gorter.

Translated from the German.

I

In forming the Communist Workers' International, it is important to explain clearly the revolutionary battle of the proletarias, which is revealed in quite a new light by the Russian and German revolutions.

We cannot do this better than by comparing the strength of the opponents of counter revolutions with the strength of the proletariat in the light of the Russian and German revolutions.. Such a comparison will clearly demonstrate the correctness of the programme of the Communist Workers' International, and the necessity for its existence.

The real countries of proletarian revolt are England and Germany, and parts of the U.S.A. These countries are truly proletarian, but history, as formerly in the Paris Commune, has caused the revolution to break out in a country less economically ready for it than they are. As happened formerly in France, the Russian revolution is a demonstration as to how revolution should **not** be made in proletarian countries. In just a few, but very important features, the Russian revolution, like the Paris Commune, may be followed as an example by the proletarian revolution in England, Germany, the U.S.A., and other countries.

The Russian Revolution was in most of its features a bourgeois-democratic one, that is to-day only a capitalist revolution. Because it was partly proletarian, partly democratic-capitalist, the Russian Revolution possesses a double character, and has become an enormous new source of light for the proletariat of the world. In so far as it was a proletarian revolution, it shows the proletariat the way to victory. In so far as it was democratic-capitalist, the revolution reveals to the proletariat new and powerful opponents, because a very large part of the world is in the condition of Russia. The immense area which is in that condition is indeed the larger part of the world. It includes almost the whole of Asia, as well as South America, parts of Central and North America, and Africa. In this area there is a rising proletariat amongst the peasants and the revolution is threatening in many places. Workmen and peasants will take part in it. The Russian Revolution, both geographically and economically stands between Eastern America and West Europe, on the one hand, and Asia on the other. It throws out its light to both sides.

To the West it shows the proletariat a small but important part of what the proletariat must do to make the social revolution.

To the East* it shows to the agrarian people, inclining owards capitalism, but rising to free themselves from feudal conditions, how they can do this with the help of the proletariat, and how they san carry out their bourgeois or peasant-capitalist revolution with the help of the proletariat and by betraying the proletariat.

On account of this double light which the Russian Revolution throws on the world revolution, we must take it as a point of departure in clearly exposing the conditions of the world proletarian struggle. The more is gradually revealed of the Russian Revolution, the better we shall understand the task before us.

We shall begin with an exposition of the double character of the Russian Revolution—and deal with it now in detail. Already we have referred to it in a general way. We shall thus deduce the strength of our opponents in Russia, Asia, and other such territories, in order, later on, to make clear the connection between the rising capitalism of Russia, Asia, and so on, with the capitalism in Europe, which is making a desperate fight to escape annihilation. From this we shall prove the correct reasoning of the Communist Workers' International.

One fundamental factor must always be borne in mind by the worker pondering over the Russian Revolution. The population of Russia consists of 8 per cent. proletarians, and 80 per cent. peasants. The proletarians desired communism, the peasants wanted re-partition of the soil and private ownership. As the peasants amounted to 80 per cent. of the population, and the proletarians to 8 per cent. only, the revolution was preponderatingly bourgeois.

The proletarians were by far the most radical and determined class and amongst the proletarians the Bolshevists, as the most coherent and determined organisation, led the revolution and brought it to victory.

The peasants subjected themselves to the proletariat only on condition that they were all to be made private owners, and that the revolution should have a bourgeois character. The proletariat could not refuse such conditions, if they wanted to carry through a revolution, that should be even partly communist, for without the support of the peasants they could not have made the revolution at all.

As the C.W.I. has always been in all countries, **we are the sharpest opponents of the Mensheviks, Kantsky, the Independents, the bourgeois pacifists, etc., in their conception that the Russian Revolution should have stopped short at the bourgeois revolution.** This conception is not only cowardly nonsense, for this would have meant the victory of reaction and the return of the monachy but above all be cause when a proletariat sees the way to world revolution it has the right and the duty to go that way. The possibility of the German and the world revolution existed and still exists.

The fault of the Bolshevists lies not in the bourgeois democratic measures which they were and are forced to take. The fault lies in the programme and the action which the Bolshevists prescribe to the European and American proletariat, whereby they tried to block the way to the proletarian world revoultion and make the building up of world capitalism possible.

By that the Bolshevists have shown and proved that the building up of the Russian bougeois democratic republic is their aim, and not Russian Communism.

By that they have shown and proved, that they are following the peasants and that they have put the peasant capitalist revolution above the proletarian revolution.

By that they have shown and proved that they have made cause with bourgeois capitalist democracy and are no longer with the proletariat.

In order that the workers should understand these truths which are kept secret from them, we shall now show in detail, which measures of the Bolshevists have a proletarian, and which a democratic bourgeois character.

*Lenin and his colleagues have played a strange role. On the one hand they have shown the world proletariat the way to Communism on the other they have helped to establish world capitalism in Russia and Asia (not to mention the peasants). For our part we shall always regard as more important the real communism towards which the English, German and North American workers are striving.

It is well-known that the measures of the Bolshevists must be divided into two parts; those from Oct., 1917, to Feb., 1921, (when the doings of Kronstadt and Petrograd took place) and those of the so called new tendency which began in February, 1921. We shall see that the measures of both periods have, to a large extent, a bourgeois character.

First let us examine the measures of the first period. The chief sharacteristics of the economic policy were at that time the nationalisation of industry, commerce and transport, the State monopoly of the most important foodstuffs and raw materials, conscript labour, regulation of the State in the industrial unions, free maintenance, including free food, housing, fuel, clothing, etc., for the workers, officials and townspeople in general, and the principle of giving unpaid service to the State. All these meausres were proletarian and communistic, as was the establishment of the workers' soviets.

The establishment of peasants' soviets on the other hand was bourgeois capitalistic, for it was certain that the peasants would fight for private property and against communism.

A proletarian revolution in Germany and England will never give the peasants political rights till they have shown that they are really communists.

The partition of the big estates, and of the land generally, was bourgeois, for this distribution made enemies of communism the peasants, that is almost the entire population of Russia.

Not only the richer and middle class of peasants were thus rendered antagonistic, but also the small peasants, even the poorest of them, and those who were hitherto landless.

Through its seizure of the land, the peasantry, now enormously swollen in numbers, because the enemy of every kind of socialist agricultural society. A genuine proletarian revolution will never admit of the partition of the soil. On the contrary, it will allow all large landed properties to pass into communist management.

The peasants, taking possession of the land made between the industrial town proletariat and the rest of the population, an unbridgeable cleavage. The boycott of the towns by the peasants and the keeping back of food from the proletarians proves this. In the beginning the cleavage could only be bridged over by capitalist means: that is to say by concersions by the capitalistically minded peasants. The Bolshevists were by the distribution of the soil condemned from the beginning to accept capitalism unless the world revolution should come to their aid.

The development after Kronstadt has shown this.

(To be continued.)

FROM GERMANY.

Taken from " The United Front," organ of German General Workers' Union.

Fellow Workers,—

Now is the hour when we ought to fight for our liberty. Long enough have we suffered reformist leaders to prophesy with deceiving comfort the salvation of labour by means of wage boards, wage contracts, made between employers, Trade Union Leaders and Parliament. Where have their policies brought you?

Hunger profoundly digging into your vitals and you clothed in your last rags. Have you thought what would happen if they also fell from your body? Look at your wife, your children, torn, ragclothed without shirt, without shoes or stockings on their feet; wretched bodies, cavernous cheeks, red eyes.

Picture of the wandering skeleton. This is the beginning of the end; rapidly we travel to barbarism.

Workers!! Notwithstanding that you see to what your Parliament policy has again and again brought you, you demand increased wages, or state aid. Do you not realise that you yourselves deceive yourselves thereby?

Do you not see, on the other side, that money gifts from the apitalists to you, are taken away from you before possessed by you?

Workers!! Finish the whole fiasco.

The hour demands from you not discussion but action. Act. Per discussion merely you are always deceived. During his fear, the Capitalist will give you everything you demand if he feels the knife at his throat—but as respite—afterwards you will pay for his fear—instigated by you. For us discussion with Capitalist cannot exist, therefore to combined workers we cry:

AWAY WITH CAPITALISM.

Not the driving away of the little girl Stressmame, but the demolition of the system.

Not control merely of articles produced, but process and production. Not to control merely finance and valuation, but without procrastination take control of private property, trade and commerce of every description. Controlling merely finance and valuation the workers would still be deceived. We have to pay the full price of commercial and industrial trickery and deceit.

Break the accursed system whose helpers are the Trade Union Leaders, and the Parliamentary parties. Organize yourselves in your factories and workshops, and the future industrial administration you yourselves will decide.

Build up your councils, your workshop delegate councils for the county and finally amgalamate the whole world of workers. Build up the fine Soviet system without paid leaders of any kind whatever.

Workers! only thus, if you intend to control your own conditions for your own class will you conquer.

Act—Now is the hour.

FROM RUSSIA.

(Out of the Manifesto of the Communist Workers Group of the C.P. of Russia.)

THE SOCIALIST UNITED FRONT.

Section Four.

Before examining the essential contents of this question, it is necessary to call to memory the circumstances under which the theses of comrade Zinowiew about the united front in Russia have been discussed and accepted. From the 19th to 21st of December the Conference of the C.P. of Russia (Bolsheviki) was held. In this conference the question of the united front was discussed. Till then, it had not been mentioned, either in the Press, or in the party meetings. At the conference, however, comrade Zinoview planted argumentative cannon in support of the united front—the conference was so much astonished that it threw up its hands and accepted the theses unanimously.

We do not say all this to offend or insult anyone, but to point out that the tactics of the united front were discussed in rather too military a manner, and that it is executed in Russia in quite a peculiar manner.

The originator of these tactics in the Comintern Conference was the C.P. of Russia. It convinced the foreign delegates that just because of these tactics of the united front, we, Russian revolutionaries, have been victorious, but these tactics are founded upon the experience of the whole " pre-revolutionary " epoch in Russia and especially upon the experience of the fight of the Bolsheviki against the Mensheviki.

The comrades who had come together from different countries, were aware only of the fact that the proletariat had vanquished, and that they themselves want to conquer their bourgeoisie. It was represented to them that the proletariat was victorious, thanks to the united front tactics. The foreign comrades could not choose, but believe, because they did not know the history of the Russian Revolution. Once comrade Lenin condemned those who believe blindly, but probably he did not want that one should not believe him merely upon his statement.

When the question arose whether we should fight for the democratic or for the socialist revolution, what were the tactics of the Bolsheviki? Did our fight for the power of the Soviets cause us to make the " socialist united front "?

The revolutionary Marxists always considered the party of the Social-Revolutionaries (S.R's) a bourgeois democratic section, unclear in its socialist definition. This view has been confirmed during the whole revolution up to the present time. And as a bourgeois democratic section, the S.R's could not attempt the practical task of a fight for the socialistic revolution and for socialism. By its unclear socialist doctrine it hindered the task in every way. But, if that is so, as it certainly is, then the victorious tactics of the revolting proletariat could not be the socialist united front but merciless opposition against this bourgeois section with its unclear socialist doctrines. Only this warfare could bring victory. It turned out so, in reality. Not in company with the S.R's, with the Mensheviki and the people's Socialists did the Russian proletariat win victory, but in warfare against them.

It is necessary to abandon the tactics of the " socialist united front " and to prepare the proletariat against the bourgeois sections with hazy socialist doctrine. At present all parties of the 2 and 2½ International are moving towards the defence of the capitalist system.

It is necessary to attempt the unification of all revolutionary elements which have for their object the destruction of the capitalistic exploiting world—*as the Communist Workers' Party of Germany, the Dutch group under the leadership of Hermann Gorter, the English and other parties*, and to fight comradely against every premature revolt and all premature actions which weaken the proletariat. It is essential to divide all honest proletarian revolutionaries who are caught in the 2 and 2½ Internationals and in the nebulous socialist terminology.

(1) Note remark from the Communist Workers' Movement of Germany:—

The Russian comrades still hope that the 3 International can become revolutionary. For this reason they press the 3 International to unite with the revolutionaries of the Fourth International. They will be compelled to bury this illusion. The Third International very consciously threw out the K.A.P. of Germany just because the Third International did not much less of revolution.

To distinguish critically between the pseudo revolutionary words of the leaders, using political propaganda and their capitalist deeds, is the next and the most important task of the comrades. They would advance further if they impartially examined the totally destructive effects created by the slogans of the Com. Intern., which referred to the retreat from the revolutionary councils and the first formation of unions, and also the taking part of the trade uninons, in Parliament and in legal councils. The downfall of the German Revolution has here one of its most essential causes. And in spite of all that, everything is repeated as before, and strictly continued. Why do not the Russian comrades understand? Do they want to believe that all those failures have been only " mistakes "?

The victory of the proletarian world revolution is impossible without a decisive breach on principle and a reckless fight with the bourgeois caricature of socialism; without the victory over the official, leading strata of the social-democratic and social reform parties. The opportunists and social-patriots are the direct class enemies of the proletariat, as they are the servitors of the bourgeoisie, especially now when they are suppressing with armed bands in company with the capitalists the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in their own, as well as in foreign countries. (See programm of the C.P. of Russia.)

Therefore, the socialist united front which, as the theses of the Com. Intern. assert, is based upon the experience of the Russion revolution, is in reality opportunist tactics. Such tactics of agreement with the avowed enemies of the working class, who with arms put down as well as of foreign countries—stands in complete contradiction with the experiences of the Russian Revolution.

The demand of the Com. Intern. (Third), that the communist parties of all countries must carry out the tactics of the socialist united front at all costs is a dogmatic stipulation which renders difficult the solution of concrete problems depending upon the objective conditions in every country, and which exercise an undoubtedly harmful influence upon the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

(To be continued.)

—THE—

Workers' Dreadnought

Founded 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

★ ★ ★

All Matter for Publication—To the Editor.
Business Communications—To the Manager.
WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT,
152 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. Post free.

Three months (13 weeks) ... ... 1s. 7½d.
Six months (26 weeks) ... ... 3s. 3d.
One year (52 weeks) ... ... 6s. 6d.

Subscriptions can start from any week.

Vol. X. No. 47. Saturday, Feb. 9th, 1924

OUR VIEW.

Indian non-co-operation undoubtedly grows. Its boycott of British goods is a form of attack against which ordinary methods of constitutional government are powerless and for which the dominant imperialism can have only such forms of retaliation as taxation of Indian home produce or other coercive methods over which the veneer of legality is but thin and doubtful. Such measures provoke widespread revolt, and can only be applied by force.

The Indian market is of great importance to the British manufacturer. India is still Britain's best customer as is shown by the following figures of trade returns:—

	1921	1922
India	111,403,846	92,939,000
U.S.A.	64,308,334	73,676,000
France	57,065,016	65,938,000
Australia	48,290,990	65,732,000
Germany	40,711,213	49,062,000

It should be observed that, whilst the trade with the other leading customers of Britain increased in 1922, with India trade declined. The 1921 trade with India had declined from that of 1920 which amounted to £184,000,000.

Mr. C. F. Andrews, who has a close knowledge of India, in an article in the "Manchester Guardian" attributes the falling off in trade to the non-co-operation movement. He declares that the attempt to substitute homespun and woven cotton cloth for the mill made variety, possesses great economic possibilities, and is certain to alter the present economic relation between India and Lancashire. He believes that the "Khadda" or "homespun" movement will affect Indian and Japanese mill made goods, even more seriously than British because the Indian and Japanese cloths are of coarser material, and therefore the Khaddar can more readily compete with them. More than 20 per cent. of the cotton cloth made in India was still being made by hand before the Khadda movement appeared. At Sabarniati, the home of Gandhi, a great spinning and weaving school has been established where hundreds of leaders are learning to spin and weave, in order to go out as teachers of local teachers who will teach the villagers.

The reason why it is believed that the home made cloth will be able to compete with the mill made, is that home spinning and weaving can be combined with agriculture, upon which alone the people can scarcely exist.

Mr. Andrews declares there is no doubt that the increased suffering at times of famine is due to the decay of village industries. During and since the war the British government and the Indian capitalist made vigorous attempts to secure the rapid industrialisation of India. The result for the Indian workers, says Mr. Andrews, has been disastrous. disastrous and the effect upon Indian life so far-reaching that it accounts for the rise of the non-co-operation movement which is as much an economic as a political one.

From these facts some may deduce that the non-co-operation movement is retrograde in its ultimate tendencies, having the effect of merely postponing the inevitable development of India by all the stages through which western countries have passed.

To adopt that view, however, is to assume that the human race can learn nothing by experience, that it can gain nothing from the international communications which are now so widespread and from the historical records and economic expositions and examples which are available for the interchange of knowledge amongst all races.

There is knowledge enough available in the world to-day to build up Communism amongst the small peasants, agriculturists and craftsmen of India, without their passing through the mills of western capitalism, without destroying rural life and herding vast sections of the population into city slums.

Modern conditions, even of mass production do not necessitate the building of the hideous vast cities, which grew up in the earlier days of industrialism. Italy, where industrialism is developing late, but rapidly, desires to preserve her ancient cities as treasuries of the arts. Therefore, her factories are establish edin the open country and her mountain torrents will more and more be used for generating electricity, to supply her lack of coal.

Modern transport and modern mechanism emancipate industry from all need for erecting great cities, and the industry of the village need by no means be carried on by primitive measures.

The workers in the village, nevertheless, require economic emancipation just as the city workers do.

The Nationalists of Gandhi's partly are not Communists; they are preaching production for profit on a small scale. It is this which forms the retrograde feature of their propaganda. This is the point which must be clearly appreciated. Communist teaching is the great need for India, as everywhere. Above all to the young Indians, who are zealously preparing themselves as teachers and propagandists, we say: "equip yourselves with Communist knowledge."

The propagandists of Khadda, who hope permanently to entrench home products as the successful rival of capitalist mass production would be fighting in a lost cause with big business, were it not that capitalism is nearing its latter end. The combination of agriculture and home industry might enable the peasant cultivator to resist the lure of the capitalist employer. When labour is scarce, however, capitalism finds for measures for driving them from the soil. This has been done in every country, in our own country most of all.

* * *

According to Mr. C. F. Andrews, Gandhi made an offer to Lord Reading to co-operate with the British Government if it would assist in suppressing the drink and drug traffic and in promoting home spinning and weaving in order to restore the prosperity of Indian village life. Gandhi explained that he knew the government derives much revenue from the drink and drug traffic and that Lancashire cotton manufacturers would oppose the home spun movement. Lord Reading deigned no reply. Gandhi will now make his proposal to the British Labour Government. How will the Labour Government respond?

Passports before the war were only used for travelling to Russia and Turkey. To require the registration of aliens with the police would have been regarded as an outrage here in pre-war days. People then travelled from county to county without restriction. Will the Labour Government lead the way in abolishing the passport and visé system and the registration of aliens which grew up during the war and linger on as though becoming a permanancy?

The release of Gandhi will be generally welcomed, but Gandhi, like every enthusiast, will be the first to declare that his release must not be regarded even an instalment of reform, and the agitation must go on. Moreover, what of the other political prisoners? Amongst them, by the way, Mr. Pathick, whose name is specially well known to our readers, for his efforts to organise the village workers in their own defence, which have been reported in our columns.

The "Daily Herald" declares that Gandhi's release will do much to "open the way to real co-operation between the government and the Indian people." The statement is mistaken. There can be no co-operation between an alien imperial government and a subject people, or in fact,, between any government and any people.

Lord Reading, the Viceroy of India, has just been defending the practice of imprisoning without trial, now extensively applied in India on the score of necessity. He threatened that the much advertised, but doubtful, Montagu-Chelmsford reforms would be withdrawn, if there should be attempts to force the hands of the British Parliament, before the British Parliament, "the great champion of liberties" as he called it, is prepared to grant Dominion Home Rule. Such statements of course, carry no conviction to the Indians, who have studied the recent history of Ireland.

Lord Reading was in a most equivocal position in professing to desire better terms of citizenship for Indians in the British Colonies and Dominions. Whilst the terms of citizenship for Indians in India are so bad. Restricted as is the franchise for the Indian legislature, he, Lord Reading, the Viceroy, has complete power to over-ride the decisions of the legislature, as he did in the notorious case of the Salt Tax last session.

The slaughter of cattle by the Board of Agriculture to check foot and mouth disease, has been accompanied by compensation for the farmer and unemployment without compensation for the labourer, who, by the way, is outside the benefits of the Insurance Act. In Cheshire 600 labourers have been unemployed for many weeks and are not expected to be re-employed for two months.

* * *

Lord Hugh Cecil's statement upon the Labour Government, which appeared in "The New Leader" embodies a dismal view of human nature. He says:

"I am sure that no community which aims at the production of wealth on a great scale can possibly be based on anything but the free operation of the instincts of acquisition and possession. All attempts to organise the production of wealth on the basis of service to the community or obedience to the State will always fail. Acquisition and possession are human passions, and can no more be set aside than the passion of sex or the passion of family affection."

A very stunted view of human nature is expressed in the above passeges. The passion to acquire and possess need not surely be wrapped up for all time in mere materialism. The acquisition of knowledge and skill provide a higher and more absorbing outlet for the energies than the mere acquisition of land and moveable property.

The time will come when the idea of competition for the possession of material wealth will seem utterly barbarous to the average human being.

Lord Hugh Cecil's prediction that we are seeing the ebb tide of democracy, and are about to enter upon an era of Fascism, is both illuminating and ominous. He observes that he does not like the prospect, but, nevertheless, he is willing to assent to it. His political associates are doubtless preparing their plans for the new era of which this Tory Lord issues complacent warning.

Lord Hugh Cecil, by the way, is regarded as a peculiarly ardent churchman. The churches are always the most devoted friends of reaction. That is natural, since they exist by the preservation of ancient superstitions. The Church of Rome has accorded enthusiastic approval to the dictatorship of Mr. Mussolini.

The fallacy and cruel snobbishness of Dean Inge as expressed in "The New Leader" are so patent that our readers will desire us to waste no space in exposing them.

* * *

Poplarism. met a rebuff from Mr. MacDonald's government when Mr. George Lansbury was offered a position under the government, but not a seat in the cabinet.

Poplarists, if not Poplarism, received another rebuff at the Pensions Ministry the other day. As everyone knows, the brokers are in at Poplar Board of Guardians because the Guardians refuse to pay for the maintenance of an ex-soldier in Brentwood Asylum. The Guardians have taken up the position that no one who has served in the Army should be a charge on the local rates. Mr. Lansbury de-

clares "it is an iniquity that men who served should have the status of paupers imposed on them after a nervous or mental breakdown.'

For our part we cannot thus divide human beings into compartments. We cannot assent to the view that men who served in the army are worthier than those who serve in industry or than the conscientious objectors who refused to serve. We do not desire to see military service elevated into a position of superior merit. The killing trade is in our view, not more, but less worthy than any other. We look forward to the day of its extinction.

Nevertheless, we sympathise with Mr. Lansbury in his dismay at finding the "Labour" Pensions Minister answering as Tory Pensions Ministers have answered, that the existing warrants limit his powers, and refusing to give any promise that he will seek authority to amend the warrants, where amendment is required. It is certainly disconcerting for supporters of the Labour Government to be told that Labour Ministers are bound by the rules of their Liberal and Tory Predecessors.

* * *

The rebuff to the students who painted lunettes for the London County Hall by invitation of the L.C.C., is remarkably ill-mannered. We do not favour the view that immature and inferior work should be put up in public buildings because it can be obtained at a low cost. We consider that students should not be encouraged to seek publicity and permanence for their efforts before they are able to produce competent work. It was perhaps a mistake to restrict one of the very rare decorative opportunities presented to artists in those days to young people who are still in the schools or to any particular group of schools. Nevertheless, we are quite sure that the artists who supervised the disputed works and certified them as worthy were much more fitted to judge of the matter than the L.C.C. committee, which first accepted and then rejected the decorations. The standard set by the architecture of the ounty Hall is not a high one. Moreover, there is plenty of room in the building for displaying many pictures. The disappointment caused to the schools and the students by the vacilliations of the L.C.C. bumbles is much to be deplored.

It is devoutly to be hoped that the establishment of the Commission of Fine Arts may at least tend to secure that the architecture and decoration of public buildings shall be referred to persons who have had some training in such matters.

* * *

The Dock Strike seems at the time of writing extremely probable, though efforts to prevent it will be made in the last days. The promise of solidarity by the National Union of Railwaymen is of an exceedingly diluted character. The N.U.R. executive writes that those of its members who come under the Shaw Agreement are to strike with the dockers. Apparently also though this is not expressly stated, all N.U.R. members are to refuse to handle goods which have been dealt with by blackleg labour at the docks.

If the promise were kept, and experience of the N.U.R. justifies no firm reliance even upon that, the promise falls short of what is required by the necessities of the case. That the Railwaymen should come out, to a man in support of the Dockers and each other is an essential condition of success, if the employers mean to fight.

The Shaw award of 1922 gave to the dockers a minimum wage of 16/- a day until 1924. Nevertheless, the trade Union leaders agreed to reductions in the wage which have brought it down to 10/- a day in the larger ports and 8/- in the smaller. In the rank and file dock strike of last year, which was resisting the final wage reduction, great bitterness was expressed by the rank and file on account of the reductions which were contrary to the award. The result was the formation of a new union for dockers and stevedores.

The Shaw Agreement has now expired. The Transport and General Workers' Union, which opposed the rank and file of its members in the strike last year, is endeavouring to rescue its fallen prestige by demanding a 2/- a day increase for its members and by declaring a strike if the demand is not conceded. The Union is also asking for the decasualising of dock labour, by means of a maintenance scheme for unemployment or a guaranteed weekly wage.

The Shaw Report of 1920 stated:

> "The system of casualisation must, if possible, be torn up by the roots. It is wrong."

The court decided for registration of all dock workers and their maintenance during unemployment.

The Shaw report of 1920 stated:

The employers accepted the report as a whole and agreed to the principle of a maintenance scheme. They did nothing, however, to put the scheme into practice and now are definitely hostile to it.

It is anticipated in many quarters that the Labour Government will introduce a bill for the registration and unemployed maintenance of dockers. Meanwhile they are asked to wait for a decision as to what their wage shall be till the doubtful passage of that measure has been attempted.

* * *

Clear evidence of the sorry liquidation of the communist revolution in Russia is the recognition of the Soviet Government by the Fascist Government. The treaty provides that the Russian property of Italians which was expropriated during the revolution is to be returned to its former owners.

The refusal of the French to follow the example of the British and Italian Governments in recognising Russia, is not now due to the politics of the Soviet Government. It is the outcome of the Franco-British rivalry and the fencing between the two powers in their efforts to secure supremacy in the new world balance of power which is being built up.

* * *

The fall of the Spanish dictatorship is daily expected. Prices of necessaries are rising and disaffection is widespread in the army as well as in the civilian population.

The Italian dictator, the murderous Mr. Mussolini, is obviously feeling his position far from secure. No other reason could have inspired his extraordinary speech to his Fascisti on January 29th. By way of opening his election campaign he declared that the next two months were likely to be the most mortifying of his life, that the late Parliament had loathed him and he had returned the loathing. Fascism he said had not created a reign of terror. There had not been wholesale executions, the streets had not re-echoed with the tramp of firing parties. We had thought it was so. Mr. Mussolini declared, however, that it was not but that it ought to have been so. Thus he explained the country would have been freed once for all of hundreds of outlaws who were in hiding.

As for the Fascist bands, the National Militia as they choose to call themselves, the dictator observed:

> "Woe to him who dares impugn the National Militia, for the only answer he will get will be a charge of lead."

He added that he meant to stay at the head of the government because he had "the will to rule" and that he and his friends were willing on questions of Fascism and Patriotism to kill or die.

E. Sylvia Pankhurst.

COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT.

Meetings.

Sunday, February 10th. 3 p.m. Hyde Park. N. Smyth and others.

Sunday, March 2nd. 7.30 p.m. Hamilton Hall, 375, High Road, Willesden Green. Sylvia Pankhurst and others.

Sunday, February 10th. 3 p.m. Lewisham Labour Club and Institute, Lanier Road, Hither Green Lane. Sylvia Pankhurst. "The Many Internationals and What They Stand For."

The recognition of Russia was inevitable and expected. Yet the recognition is as yet only formal. The note communicating the decision is cold and cautious. It indicates that the recognition accorded, thus far, does not entail normal conditions of complete friendly relations and full commercial intercourse. These are only to be vouchsafed after certain conditions have been fulfilled. They include:

(1) A settlement of the position of the treaties made between Czarist Russia and Britain before the revolution.

(2) The settlement of claims made by the two governments against each other.

(3) The restoration of Russian credit.

(4) There must be no reason to suspect propaganda by either power against the interests of the other or for the overthrow of its institutions.

The demand for the restoration of Russian credit in ominous. Evidently it means that Russia's credit must be restored in a capitalist sense. It may cover a number of far-reaching demands. We wish indeed that open diplomacy may be employed throughout the negotiations between the Soviet government and the Labour government. There is much to be learnt from them.

As to the propaganda question, a Socialist should always welcome propaganda.

The fact of British recognition being made known to the Second Union Congress of Soviets, which happens to be in session, the Congress received the news with great enthusiasm. It responded by expressions of fraternal proletarian solidarity, quite out of keeping with the icy and calculating manner in which the subject was being handled in London. The Congress resolution affirmed that full normal diplomatic relations have been established between Britain and Russia; but Mr. MacDonald's note expressly states that this is not the case.

Moreover, it should be observed that Mr. MacDonald only recognises the Soviet government as the de jure government over those states which recognise the Soviet government. Thus he provides himself with a loophole for refusing to recognise Georgia or any other State he may wish to exclude from the Soviet Union.

Notice too, that he appoints not an ambassador as yet, but a mere Chargé d'Affaires. These nuances are of vast importance in those exalted circles in which the Labour Premier is now moving. Most significant is the fact that the man he has chosen to represent his government in Moscow is one that successive capitalist governments have used as an intermediary in Russia.

The "Daily Telegraph" confidently asserts that Mr. MacDonald's note was not presented to Mr. Chicherine until after the British Government representative reported to the British Foreign Office that the Soviet Government had agreed to apply for membership of the League of Nations and had promised a complete cessation of propaganda within the confines of China and India.

As to the League of Nations question, the "Telegraph" further states that Mr. Litvinoff and others of the Soviet Government violently oppose participation. Refusal to participate in the League has hitherto been the policy which Soviet Russia, as a country of proletarian revolution, wisely and necessarily adopted. The new economic policy has, however, changed Soviet policy in many respects, and probably in this also.

Yet the responsibility of coercing Soviet Russia into the League by making recognition conditional upon her application for membership, is one that it is to be hoped Mr. MacDonald has not taken. The League of Nations is essentially a gathering of capitalist powers and it will obviously be used by the strong powers to whitewash their plunder of the weak.

E. Sylvia Pankhurst.

Published by E. Sylvia Pankhurst, at 152 Fleet St., London, E.C.4., and printed by the Agenda Press, Ltd. (T.U.), at 10 Wine Office Court, London.