



Workers' Dreadnought

ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

VOL. VII. No. 37.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1920.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

PATRIOTIC IRELAND.

An Open Letter to British Trades Unionists.

Dear Fellow Workers,

During the War you were urged by the Press, the Government, your employers and your Labour and Trade Union leaders to be patriotic. You took your thinking orders with scarcely a backward thought.

You were also told by these worthies that you must stand up for small nations and admire their patriotism. You were told that war in defence of nationality was a glorious thing: you were told that you must support a fight to a finish in defence of your nationality, and to protect the small nationalities from the big. You obediently fought for little Belgium and little Serbia, and for Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig-Holstein, and their alleged great longing to be freed from German rule.

We Communists told you that nationality is really a very secondary matter and that the capitalist exploitation of labour knows no boundaries. (We said that the war was a capitalist war, in which the workers were merely the exploited tools, and that your capitalist bosses would use the German workers to blackleg you as soon as British capitalism had won the war on Germany.)

But you British Trade Unionists refused to listen to us. You preferred to echo the opinions of Lloyd George and Northcliffe, and of Henderson, Clynes and Thomas. You agreed with them that the war was a glorious war, and that to be patriotic is the only human virtue.

We told you, plainly and often, that in your professed belief in patriotism, you were simply repeating the parrot-cries of the political wire-pullers without thinking of yourselves at all. You would by no means admit that, at the time, but here some of you are now giving most valuable utterance to sentiments precisely opposite from those you used to shout, and you have changed merely because the newspapers and your leaders have told you to.

To-day some of you say it is quite the proper thing for a great Empire to use force to make itself, or to maintain itself as the greatest Empire in the world.

To aspire to world hegemony was a sin (as some of you did not know it meant world control)—the greatest of all sins—the Kaiser was to be hung for it; you were ready to give your lives to get him hung for it.

But now Lloyd George tells you that the sin was only a sin because the Kaiser was a German; it was a deadly sin for him to want his empire to be the greatest in the world; but it is quite legitimate for Lloyd George and King George to want their empire to be the greatest.

As for the small nationalities, it was plucky for little Belgium and little Serbia, and Alsace-Lorraine, and Schleswig-Holstein to put up a fight for their nationality—but Ireland, that is another matter! Ireland is putting up a fight against the "benefits of British rule."

If you were really thinking for yourselves during the war, British Trades Unionists, if you are thinking for yourselves now, if you really believed in the virtue of patriotism and the glory of fighting for small nationality, you must part company with Lloyd George and Northcliffe now. You must part company with them because they expect you to be dishonest enough to change your views, just because it is not the German Empire that happens to be the dominant Great Empire in question, but your Empire, or rather the Empire of Lloyd George and King George—for, of course, you are only workers in the Empire—you do not own any part of it.

Some of you do not agree with that, fellow Trades Unionists, but many of you do. That is the kind of thing you cheer for when Mr. Thomas says it. It really seems that, for once, you have found an article you can safely show to the secretary of your Trade Union without offending him. The secretary of your Union will agree with this; Mr. Thomas, Mr. Henderson, and Mr. Clynes will all agree, and the proof of this you will say is that these gentlemen have parted company with Lloyd George and Northcliffe, they have come out of the Coalition Government and they are now in opposition to the Government—except, of course, at moments of "National crisis" like a gas strike, or a coal strike, or where "increased production" is concerned.

On the question of Ireland your Trades Union leaders are definitely in opposition to the Government.

By F. O'BRIEN.

"Daily Herald" Makes a Mistake.

The "Daily Herald" says that "Labour's Policy" is that of "offering Ireland anything it wanted up to and inclusive of an independent republic." But that is not correct. When the "Daily Herald" says "Labour" in this connection, it means, I suppose, the Labour Party. Evidently the writer of the "Herald" article has not read the Labour Party scheme, which I explained last week. The Labour Party scheme proposes not to offer an independent republic, with Dominion Home Rule, with agreements, in which the British Government would be able to dictate what terms it pleased, on Police, Customs, Posts, and many other questions.

Labour Leaders Turn Pacifist.

Nevertheless, the Labour Party is opposed to the Government on the Irish question, but your Labour leaders are opposed also to the Irish. They do not like this fighting. They hate all violence. They

HOME: Where the Revolutionary Education should begin.

Our Xmas Number

will be out on December 18th.

Place Your Order NOW!

Devote some part of your Xmas Holiday to the study of your Class Needs.

told you, British Trades Unionists, to "fight to a finish," to give even the last man and the last shilling, even the Trades Union rules, and privileges, to win the war. But now they have turned quite squeamish, the very mention of the bloodshed they lately thought so glorious, now shocks them. And this is true even of such redoubtable warriors as Colonel Will Thorne. It is only the pacifist "Daily Herald" that says: "We have appealed over and over again to the Irish to hold their hands and abstain from violence." The "Herald" did not say that to the British Government during the war with Germany; it did not even say it to little Belgium, or little Serbia. It said, our soldiers are fighting gloriously, but let the efforts of the Generals to overcome Germany be reinforced by the efforts of the diplomats. If we can overcome Germany and secure all our objects by negotiations, let us negotiate for peace without laying down our arms.

Your Labour leaders, as you will remember, most of them disagreed with the "Daily Herald." "Peace by negotiation" was anathema to them. All talk of a truce they regarded as high treason—even the "Herald" dared not mention such a thing, yet now, whilst the Labour leaders ask for Irish votes on the plea that they are defending the Irish cause, they ask the Irish to accept "A Truce of God" without any conditions, and denounce them for using violence.

On Monday, November 22nd, your Labour leaders read in their morning papers that on Sunday the Irish had killed fourteen Government servants, and injured six, and that the British Government agents had fired on a crowd of 15,000 people, killing 12 and injuring 75 men, women and children. Your British Labour leaders at once passed a long resolution censuring the Irish, and postponed their visit to Ireland to show their disapproval of Irish behaviour.

This resolution of the British Labour leaders said:

"This meeting of the Parliamentary Labour Party expresses its deep horror of the brutal assassination of British subjects, civilian and military, during the past week-end . . . condemns acts of violence committed against agents of the British Government and others, under whatever provocation . . . it calls upon the leaders of the Sinn Fein movement to repudiate the outrages."

The Labour leaders did not talk like that during the war; we never heard them speak of the killing of the Germans on the battle-front as "brutal outrage," we never heard of their making a protest against the shooting of German spies caught in London.

If Belgian people during the occupation had killed fourteen German officers, would you British Trades

Unionists have denounced the affair as a brutal outrage? You would not. Your leaders would have called it a brave and gallant action.

But your leaders will tell you British Trades Unionists that the comparison is absurd. Yet Sir Hamar Greenwood, the British Government representative, has plainly told us that Britain is at war with Ireland. On November 24th he declared that the British military are justified in burning Irish creameries, because they are sometimes used as an ambush. This was the case, he alleged, at Bally Macallagot; therefore, he insisted: "as an act of war they were justified in burning a portion of it down."

The Irish have always claimed that their struggle is a war with a foreign enemy which occupies their country. The British Government has hitherto insisted there is no war in Ireland, but only disorder and insurrection.

Now the British Government admits a state of war, not only by this declaration of Hamar Greenwood, but by the decision to intern the troops of the Irish Republican Army. But the British Government has never accorded the Irish combatants the status to which they would be entitled in fighting a foreign enemy.

James Conolly, a wounded prisoner, would have been held till the end of the war and then released, had he been a German. Because he was an Irishman, he was shot as a felon with fifteen other companions in arms. The British Labour Party made no protest against these executions.

You are following your leaders, British Trades Unionists, when you say, as some of you do, that it is unpardonable for the Irish to carry their war into England. They are preparing Downing Street and the Houses of Parliament as though to withstand a siege.

The Irish do not like a war in their country any more than you do, and all sections of the Irish population, even those who are strictly non-combatant, are being obliged to endure conditions whilst the Irish war has been restricted to the other side of the Irish Channel, and you, British Trades Unionists, and the rest of the British public, have not troubled much about it. Those who are conducting the Irish side of the Anglo-Irish war are now determined to wake up John Bull at last, to make him feel that his peace and comfort are involved in the Irish war, and to see that he does not close off again until it is settled.

The Labour Party protests that reprisals or aggression by the Irish will handicap the Labour Party's efforts to secure a settlement of the Irish question, but the Labour Party took no interest in the Irish question at all until bloodshed and murder and the sacking of houses had become the habitual order of the day in Ireland. If everything were quiet over there to-day, there would be no question of any settlement, nor would the Labour Party concern itself with the matter.

During the war, you British Trades Unionists were enthusiastic nationalists; now that you may be asked to sympathise with Irish nationalism, some of you are internationalists. You have never shown any solidarity with the Irish workers as good internationalists should, it must be pointed out. If you want to be good internationalists, you should study the Communist methods of settling the Irish question:—

(1) Ireland to have the status of an independent nation.

(2) Irish Soviets of delegates from workers in all industries, and land workers, to legislate for and administer Irish affairs, landlordism and capitalism being abolished, and common ownership of the land and means of production, distribution and exchange established.

(3) Any questions in dispute between the two nations to be submitted to arbitration by Soviet Russia.

Some of you, British Trades Unionists, will tell us that these proposals are Utopian. We Communists are compelled to answer that though these proposals are difficult of accomplishment, they are the only proposals that will meet the case.

The proposals would not seem Utopian if British Trades Unionists were determined to set up the Soviets in Britain.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND INCREASED PRODUCTION.

By P. F. MEACHEM.

For over a year a capitalist organisation known as "The National Propaganda" has been sending out speakers to street corners, and giving dinner-hour lectures on "Increased Production."

At a motor works in the vicinity of Hammersmith, following a series of dinner-hour lectures, one Wednesday one-third of the staff received notice, and a few days later another third also received notice.

This is typical of how the capitalist class is acting at the present time. Their paid speakers have been advocating increased production as a remedy for alleviating unemployment. So have also some of the sane, sensible, reliable Trade Union leaders.

The capitalists are doing this by dismissing more employees, throwing them out on an already overcrowded labour market, to compete with the others, thereby lowering the money wages of the workers. Unemployment is increasing week by week. Tens of thousands of workers are being thrown out of work to exist on a dole of fifteen shillings a week, and ex-servicemen, after fighting for their (?) country, are existing on one pound a week. Last week at Acton the wife of an ex-serviceman died of starvation.

Why All This Misery?

What need is there for all this misery, destitution, and starvation? Is it because of the lack of raw materials; of labour; or because Science is standing still? Because there is not the land, or machinery, or labour-power to work the land? With these points I will deal later.

Is it because of the lack of foodstuffs, as compared with pre-war days, caused by the five years' war? It is certainly not for this reason, as the following facts will show:—

The total imports of every kind of grain and flour in 1912 were 220,296,933 cwt. In 1919 they dropped to 145,207,257 cwt. Nevertheless, wheat, meal and flour rose from 10,189,476 cwt. to 17,892,170 cwt. The principal fall has been in maize.

As for sugar, in 1913, we imported just under three million tons, our consumption being just under two million tons. The average production of sugar over the whole world for the five years ending 1913 was 7,740,518 tons. For the two years 1918 and 1919 the world production was 37,424,910 tons. Sugar is tenpence per pound! What of the laws of supply and demand we hear the capitalist economists prating about? Who are the people cornering the food supplies? Perhaps some Cabinet Minister will tell us!

We will next take meat. We have in cold storage over fourteen million carcasses of frozen mutton, enough to last thirty months, without importing any more for that period. This could be sold at threepence to fourpence per pound, and then a profit could be made out of it.

The total of dead meat, which includes beef, mutton, bacon and tinned stuff, was, in 1913, 23,285,255 cwt., and in 1919 this was increased to 25,561,099 cwt. Compare the 1913 prices and the 1919 prices, and think over it.

Next as to clothes. The imports of wool in 1913 was 802,096,772 lbs. In 1919 the imports reached the astounding figures of 1,042,399,164 lbs.

Yet clothes are three or four times dearer in 1919 than in 1913, and this in spite of the fact that the price of raw wool has declined fifty per cent. since last April ("Daily Express," October 7th, 1920). This means that the raw materials for making a suit length of good botany serge costs nearly £2 10s. less than it did in April.

Then next digest this, you unemployed workers, as well as the employed; you who expect the Government to do something for you! This is from the same issue: "It was announced recently that the Government had decided, at the request of the trade, to curtail the offerings of wool at last week's sales in London, presumably with the object of maintaining values."

Tea is the next thing. In 1913 we imported 305,530,044 lbs. of tea. In 1919 the figures reached 383,465,044 lbs.

Then, as a last example, we will take raisins and currants. In 1913 we got 2,011,791 cwt.; in 1916, 3,808,481 cwt.

The figures just given speak for themselves. It is not because of the lack of food caused by the five years of war that men, women and children are starving to-day.

Then, supposing there was not the supplies of commodities just given? Is it due to the lack of land, and of labour and machinery to work the land? Certainly not. The area of Great Britain is over 56 million acres. Of this 32 millions are cultivable. Seventeen million acres are laying idle at the present time. There are less workers on the land than ever. Science has shown us the way to increase our food supplies far in excess of the increase of population.

Kropotkin, in "Fields, Factories and Workshops," in Appendix T, tells us that by placing poles five yards high in the ground, and fixing and exposing live electric wires on them, we obtain an increase of 30 to 40 per cent. in the wheat crops, as compared with fields not treated in this way. Beet-roots and strawberries show a similar increase by like treatment.

In the "World's Work" for January, 1919, there is a description of an experiment with wheat seeds. They were steeped in a tank of water and then charged with a weak current of electricity, and then taken out and dried.

The yield from seed treated in this way varies, on the average, from 6 to 16 bushels per acre, but there has always been an increase, though not always to the same extent. There has also been an improvement in quality, increased weight ranging from one pound to four pounds per bushel; an increase in the stoutness and length of the straw; whereas the bulk of unelectricised seed threw up only two culms or straws per seed, the electricised threw up five.

In America they have in use machines which plough an acre of land in four minutes. Why not use them here?

From the foregoing, it is clear that it is not due to the lack of land, the lack of workers, the lack of finished commodities, that people are starving to-day.

According to a statement by the Director General of Food Supplies ("Daily News," May 29th, 1918), we were able to grow food for forty out of fifty-two weeks for the year 1918.

This, with seven million men engaged in the army and in the making of munitions—purposes of destruction. At the present time six millions have returned, and we are not growing food for forty weeks in the year. Mr. McCurdy, in a speech in the House of Commons, on May May, 1920, said: "It is lamentable that our home production of wheat is again rapidly falling. Last year the decline in wheat acreage in the United Kingdom was 400,000 acres. Mr. G. Lambert thinks that this year there will be a further falling off of 200,000 acres. 'Double that,' interposed Sir Beville Stanier, a leading agricultural authority." The latter statement has been borne out.

In reply to Mr. Clough, Mr. McCurdy, the Food Controller, on the 19th October, 1920, stated that the area under wheat cultivation in this country was 368,000 acres less than last year.

According to a speech of Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons on November 15th, this year, there are now three million less workers on the land than was the case fifty years ago.

This is going on whilst the capitalist class is prating about increased production. If the Government was sincere about eliminating unemployment, and increasing production, they would not allow this to go on. Increased production under capitalism is for the benefit of the capitalists, and not the workers.

Why People Are Starving.

Then why is it that people are starving in the midst of plenty, when there is more than enough land, plenty of labour, plenty of raw materials and machinery to produce wealth for all?

Because of the private ownership of the means of wealth production and distribution. But what is the reason for this? Because we have in society a class or section of society living without contributing towards the production and distribution of life's basic necessities, food, clothing, and shelter; consequently this idle class must live upon the products of the labours of the wealth-producing section.

It will be conceded that there are only two ways of getting a living to-day: either by applying our labour-power to Nature's resources, or by living upon the labours of the wealth producers. Consequently, if in any society there exists a section living without contributing towards the production of life's basic necessities, that class can only live by preventing the wealth-producers from consuming all the wealth produced.

We have this idle class in society to-day, and in order to do this it has taken possession of the land, etc., thereby owning the lives of the dispossessed section of the community.

The land being essential for the well-being of all, the workers therefore have no choice but to sell their labour-power to the owning class; in other words, their labour power becomes a commodity. It is due to the commodity nature of the workers' labour power that the owning class is able to take two-thirds of the wealth produced.

The annual income of Great Britain in 1914 was over £2,000,000,000. This is divided into two portions, wages and profits; respectively, the workers' share and the exploiters' share.

The larger becomes the workers' share, the smaller the exploiters' share, and vice versa; consequently, it is to the interests of the exploiters to keep the workers' share down to the lowest possible level.

This is done by keeping an army of unemployed workers on the labour market. The workers' labour power being a commodity, the same as coffee, cocoa, sugar, etc., its price (wages) is determined in the same way as the price of these commodities: the cost of production, the relations between the supply and demand (the competition between the sellers on one hand, and the buyers on the other), and when a monopoly exists. To-day, we have people offering an article for sale, but along comes another equally desirous of capturing the market; consequently, he offers his at a lower price, with the result that the other seller is compelled to sell his at a lower

price still. The more there are competing, the lower falls the price, with the result that if it falls below the cost of production, capital is withdrawn from that industry.

On the other hand competition on the part of the buyers forces up the price. When there is a scarcity, when the supply falls below the demand, the competition amongst the buyers forces up the price.

Then we have the monopoly: that is when a combine gets possession of all the available supply of an article. There being no one to undersell, those people desirous of obtaining this article have no choice but to pay the price demanded by the monopolists.

Bearing in mind that the capitalists as a class are non-wealth producers; that the commodities in which they deal are only produced by the application of human labour-power applied to the land, etc.; consequently, they must buy this commodity, the workers' labour-power. We will now apply these conditions to the latter commodity.

The Present System.

Under the present system of society there is always a large army of unemployed workers, more men than there are jobs, a supply in excess of the demand. If this were not so, the worker would have a monopoly of their labour-power.

If there were only one hundred men for each one hundred jobs, there being no one to sell his labour at a lower price, the worker could demand the whole product of his labour; consequently, this would mean the breakdown of the capitalist system.

But there is always a greater number of men than there are jobs, therefore the more workers there are in excess of the number required, the lower will fall the workers' price (wages); and the larger becomes the masters' profits. Thus it is to the interests of the capitalists to keep a large army of unemployed labour to rob the workers of the major portion of the wealth produced. We now get to the real motive underlying the increased production stunt. If they can get four workers to do the work of six, this means the saving of two workers' wages; secondly, it means there are fewer jobs and more workers to compete for them; consequently a second reduction in the workers' wages. This is the basis of the increased production stunt of the "National Propaganda."

This increased production is no remedy for unemployment. There is only one remedy, i.e. the abolition of the private ownership of the means of wealth production and distribution, and the institution of the common ownership of these means. This is the only way out.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Dear Comrade,—I have read the article by Comrade J. T. Murphy entitled "Urgent Questions," and I think he has got the "wind up" unnecessarily. At this juncture it is hardly likely that the authorities will openly suppress the advocacy of Communist principles. It is as well to interpret economic development correctly. The phase he presents is one by no means near at hand. From practical experience, the operation of the black list and the boycott serves the purpose for the moment of beating our exponents to their knees when corruption fails. (When this is no longer of any avail, we shall use other lines of action, determined by the nature of the attack and the forces at our disposal. While we must not blink at facts, I cannot see any useful purpose in raising bogies. The force of economic necessity will compel the workers to adopt our policy—at best we can only go on talking; and I feel sure that all that the upholders of the present order can bring to bear upon us will never crush the expression of revolutionary sentiments. The unity of our forces, which have been somewhat disturbed, will shortly be realised, and in consequence of the close examination of our various policies we shall hammer out one which I am thoroughly convinced will be so effective that, with minor adjustments, as the occasion arises, will carry us on to the final consummation of our ideals, which, as materialists, have their roots in the economic growth of society. While recognising the trend which lays in our direction, we must not over estimate ourselves, and those who do not think that the general mass of the working class would fall to so-called "immediate benefits," are sadly mistaken. Hence cardboard erections only lower the prestige of the movement. Without the backing of the virile section of the working class, as represented by the industrially organised workers, we cannot advance. It is to them we must make our proposals, with the certainty that ultimately they will realise that revolutionary Socialism or Communism, just as you care to label it, is a true reflex of their economic well-being.

F. REMINGTON.

Makoni's electric train pulled up at the Niko-lievsk railway station in Moscow at midnight on the 18th of October. The train left Petrograd at 8.15 a.m. on the same day and made five stoppages on the journey. The whole distance between Petrograd and Moscow was covered without a single load.

The Communist Parties and the Question of Parliamentarism.

[From the Thesis presented to the Second World Congress of the Communist International (Petrograd-Moscow), July, 1920.]

In many countries of Western Europe and America one of the most acute questions of Communist tactics is that of Parliamentarism. The division in the German Communist Party, the formation of an anti-parliamentary faction in the Italian party, the position of the Belgian Communist group, and, lastly, the attitude of the revolutionary Syndicalist circles and the I.W.W.—all these demand precise and definite directions on this question from the Communist International.

Parliamentarism, as a State system, is a "democratic" form of the rule of the bourgeoisie, which at a certain stage of its development needs the fiction of a national representation, that outwardly would be an organisation of the will of all the classes, but in reality would be an instrument of oppression and suppression in the hands of the ruling capitalists.

Parliamentarism is a definite form of State order. Therefore it can in no way be a form of Communist society, which recognises neither classes, nor class struggle, nor any form of State authority.

Parliamentarism cannot be a form of proletarian government during the transition period between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and that of the proletariat. At the moment when the class struggle turns into civil war the proletariat must inevitably form its organisation as a fighting organisation, which cannot contain any of the representatives of the former ruling classes; all fictions of a "national will" are harmful to the proletariat at the time, and a parliamentary division of authority is needless and injurious to it; the only form of proletarian dictatorship is a Republic of Soviets.

The bourgeois parliaments, which constitute one of the most important apparatus of the State machinery of the bourgeoisie, cannot be won over by the proletariat any more than can the bourgeois order in general. The task of the proletariat consists in blowing up the whole machinery of the bourgeoisie, in destroying it, and all the parliamentary institutions with it, whether they be republican or constitutional-monarchical.

The same relates to the communal institutions of the bourgeoisie, which theoretically it is not correct to consider as State organisations. In reality they are part of the same apparatus of the State machinery of the bourgeoisie, which must be destroyed by the revolutionary proletariat and replaced by local Soviets or Workers' Deputies.

Communism to Repudiate Parliamentarism.

Consequently, Communism repudiates parliamentarism as the form of the future; it renounces the same as a form of the class dictatorship of the proletariat; it repudiates the possibility of winning over the parliaments; its aim is to destroy parliamentarism. Therefore it is only possible to speak of utilising the bourgeois State organisations with the object of destroying them. The question can only and exclusively be discussed on such a plane.

Every class struggle is a political struggle, because it is finally a struggle for power. Any strike, when it spreads through the whole country, is a threat to the bourgeois State and thus acquires a political character. To strive to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to destroy its State by any means whatever, means to carry on political warfare. To create one's own class apparatus—for the management and suppression of the resisting bourgeoisie—whatever such an apparatus may be—means to gain political power.

Consequently, the question of a political struggle does not end in the question of one's attitude towards the parliamentary system. It is a general condition of the class struggle of the proletariat, in so far as the struggle grows from a small and private one to a struggle for the overthrow of the capitalist order.

The elementary method of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the method of demonstration en masse. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by organised masses of the proletariat, under the direction of a united, disciplined centralised Communist Party. Civil war is war. In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political general staff, to command all the operations during all the stages of the fight.

The struggle in masses means a whole system of developing demonstrations, growing ever more acute in form and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of government. In this warfare fare of the masses, developing into a civil war, the directing party of the proletariat must, as a general rule, secure all and every lawful position, making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work, and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the struggle en masse.

One of such auxiliary support is the tribune of the bourgeois parliament. Against participation in a political party struggle one should not use the argument that parliament is a bourgeois government institution.

The Communist Party enters such institution not for the purpose of organisation work, but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within (for instance, the work of Liebknecht in Germany, of the Bolsheviks in the Imperial Duma, in the "Democratic Conference," in the "pre-parliament" of Kerensky, and,

lastly, in the "Constituent Assembly," and also in the Municipal Dumas).

This work within the parliaments, which consists chiefly in making revolutionary propaganda from the parliamentary tribune, the denunciation of enemies, the ideological uniting of the masses, etc., must be fully subordinated to the objects and tasks of the mass struggle outside the parliaments.

Conditions of Parliamentary Action.

The following conditions are indispensable:—(1) The absence of all "autonomy" for the parliamentary Communist groups, and their unconditional subordination to the Central Committee of the Party; (2) constant control and direction by the Party Executive Committee; (3) the adaptation of parliamentary demonstrations to those going on outside the parliament; (4) revolutionary attitude in the parliament, i.e. the absence of all "principled" fear of overstepping the limits of parliamentary regulations; (5) the execution of part of the work outside the parliament, especially in connection with the mass demonstrations, by the Communist members of the parliament; (6) to be in constant touch with the illegal work and to profit by parliamentary immunity, as far as it exists, for these purposes; (7) an immediate remand or exclusion from the Party of any member of the parliamentary group who violates in his parliamentary work any of the orders of the Party.

The elective campaign must be carried on not in the sense of obtaining a maximum of votes, but in that of a revolutionary mobilisation of the masses around the mottoes of the Proletarian Revolution. The election campaign must be conducted by the entire mass of party members, not by the leaders alone; it is necessary to make use of and be in complete touch with all the demonstrations of masses (strikes, demonstrations, movements among the soldiers and sailors, etc.) going on at the given moment; it is necessary to summon all the masses of the proletarian organisations to active work.

In complying with all these conditions, the parliamentary work must present a contrast to the dirty "politics" which is practised by the Social-Democratic parties of all countries, who enter parliaments for the purpose of supporting the "democratic" institution, or at the best to "win it over." The Communist Party can only recommend a revolutionary use of the parliament, exemplified by Karl Liebknecht, Höglund and the Bolsheviks.

"Anti-parliamentarism," in the sense of an absolute and categorical repudiation of participation in the elections and the parliamentary revolutionary work, cannot therefore bear criticism, and is a naive childish doctrine which is founded sometimes on a healthy disgust of politicians, but which does not understand the possibilities of revolutionary parliamentarism. Besides, very often this doctrine is connected with a quite erroneous representation of the role of the Party, which in this case is considered not as a fighting, centralised advanced guard of the workers, but as a decentralised system of badly-joined revolutionary nuclei!

On the other hand, an acknowledgement of the value of parliamentary work does in no wise lead to an absolute, in-all-and-any-case acknowledgement of the necessity of concrete elections and a concrete participation in parliamentary sessions. The matter depends upon a series of specific conditions. In certain combinations it may become necessary to leave the parliament. The Bolsheviks did so when they left the pre-parliament in order to break it up, to weaken it and to set up against it the Petrograd Soviet, which was then prepared to head the uprising; they acted in the same way in the Constituent Assembly on the day of its dissolution, transferring the meeting to the Third Congress of Soviets. In other circumstances a boycotting of the elections may be necessary, and a direct violent storming of the parliamentary bourgeois clique, or a participation in the elections with a boycott of the parliament itself, etc.

In this way, while recognising as a general rule the necessity of participating in the elections to the central parliament, and to the institutions of local self-government, as well as in the work in such institutions, the Communist Party must decide the question concretely, according to the specific conditions of the given moment. Boycotting the elections or the parliament, or leaving the parliament, is allowable, chiefly when there is a chance of an immediate transformation into an armed fight for the power.

At the same time one must constantly bear in mind the relative unimportance of this question. If the centre of gravity lies in a struggle for the power outside the parliament, then naturally the question of a proletarian dictatorship and a fight in masses is brought forward, for it is immeasurably greater than the secondary one of using the parliament.

Therefore the Communist International insists categorically that it considers any division or attempt at a division within the Communist Parties united on this aim as a crime against the Labour movement. The Congress calls upon all the elements which are in favour of the struggle in masses for the proletarian dictatorship, under the direction of a centralised Party of the revolutionary proletariat gaining influence over all the mass-organisations of the working-class—to strive for a complete unity between the Communist elements, notwithstanding any possible disagreement on the question of parliamentarism.

OGMORE VALLEY NOTES.

By "COMMUNIST."

Ireland.

A subject which is agitating the minds of the workers of the Valley at the present time is undoubtedly that of Erin's Isle. It is rather surprising to find the number of workers who are still gulled by what they read in the capitalist Press in regard to this unhappy country. On Sunday evening, November 21st, at Ogmores Vale Hall, Professor Ernest Hughes, of Swansea University, delivered an address on "The Romance of Welsh History," and in the course of his remarks, he pointed out very strikingly the spirit of determination on the part of the Welsh people in the Seventeenth Century, to resist the invasion of their country by the English tribes, and in so doing retaining their independence, which gave them the power of working out their own salvation. The speaker was listened to very attentively by the audience, and received great applause at the termination of his lecture. But how many of the audience present who applauded the speaker with such enthusiasm, who are not at this very moment speaking so disparaging of their Irish comrades, and who are hurling such contemptible insinuations against them? Comrades, beware of the snares of the capitalist Press, whose one and only function is to pit worker against worker, to divide and conquer. Comrades, let me refer you to the able pamphlet, "The Irish Tragedy," by John Maclean, M.A., which exposes the tyranny of British rule and of modern capitalism, by a so-called Christian country. When are we, as workers, going to raise the banner of Karl Marx? "Workers of the World, Unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have a World to gain." How long, Comrades?

The S.W.M.F. (Garw District).

Social Science Classes have now commenced under the auspices of the above at Bridgend, under the tutorship of Mr. Ted Williams, Miners' Agent. As Communists, we should like to see a large number of our young men attend the above classes. The capabilities of Comrade Williams as a lecturer are well known in South Wales, and are very highly appreciated. Hurry up, Comrades, and join the class, education is the need of the hour, especially in the great Labour Movement.

Wyndham Lodge.

At the last annual meeting for the election of officers for the above lodge, the advanced section succeeded in ousting a few of the reactionaries who styled themselves Labour men, when they were simply disguised Liberals. As 1920 is rapidly drawing to a close, the re-election of officers will soon be upon us. We wished to draw the attention of the advanced wing to the forces which are now mobilising for the overthrow of the present officers who have done such excellent work on behalf of their fellow-workers. Attend your lodge meetings, Comrades, and put your shoulder to the wheel in order to retain the advanced intellectuals of the lodge. Start your propaganda immediately.

Burnham Scale.

The topic of the hour among School Teachers at present is that of the Burnham Scale of Salaries, which seems very unsatisfactory to the teachers of South Wales. Criticism of the scale is of no avail, as the N.U.T. Executive has accepted same, and the outline of which has been forwarded to the various associations for consideration. The Scale met with a very hostile reception at the hands of the Ogmores and Garw Association of the N.U.T., who complained that the conference held at Cardiff was very carefully prepared before the delegates had assembled to air their views on the matter. What the N.U.T. lacks to-day is a revolutionary outlook, and it is high time that the advanced elements, who form a very small minority, should instil into the minds of the officials of their union the need for bringing such an outlook to maturity. Teachers, attend your meetings. Do not let the few bear the brunt of the work, but make yourselves active in your association, and put an end to that middle-class point of view for all time, as it still permeates your organisation; and, in so doing, you will be strengthening your comrades in the Labour Movement.

DREADNOUGHT DEVELOPMENT FUND.

A. Stratton	5 s. d.
A. M. Emery	0 5 6
Profits on Stepney Social	5 16 0
Profits on Bow Social	2 16 0
Mrs. Brinkley	0 10 0
Mrs. Clark	0 10 0
G. S. Williams	0 10 0
Per H. P. Burgess	1 16 0
E. E. Swift	0 7 0
E. E. Everson	0 17 8
Per M. E. Marsh	0 17 6
Per Miss B. Nathan	1 0 0
	15 8 8
Brought forward	59 13 9
	475 1 5

There are not less than 85,000 deaths from accidental causes each year in the United States, or at the rate of 81 per 100,000 of the population.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

Published by the Communist Party.
(British Section of the Third International).

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.
Acting Editor: JACK O'SULLIVAN.

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

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

Vol. VII. No. 37. Saturday, December 4, 1920.

THE WORKER AND HIS RELATION
TO CAPITALISM.

By J. Johnson.

That evils are prevalent in present-day society is obvious even to its dullest member. They are glaring. Unemployment, insanitary conditions everywhere, disease, crime, prostitution, etc. We have speeches by the thousand from Parliament, pulpit, and orators of all descriptions, dwelling upon them. Of course we must not forget the Press. They (the newspapers), too, have something to say. What is more, they all have remedies.

Remedies.

Without troubling about finding out the cause for the above evils, some persons, well disposed and otherwise, offer quack remedies, and you are told if you only give them a trial all will be well. One of the most amusing is that for unemployment. Most people know it by now. What was it? "Speed up production and the unemployed will be absorbed into industry." Seeing that the speeding up of production causes unemployment, one can only marvel at the audacity of all the quack doctors who gave that prescription. Tuberculosis is rife in the land. "All right," says Lloyd George. "The nation will build sanatoria for these people." What about the insanitary conditions that breed tuberculosis? No reply to that question.

Reforms.

We also have an army of reformers, such as Labour legislators and Trade Union leaders, tinkering with the system. For these people there is no class war. The Labour M.P.s are going to legislate poverty out of existence. The I.L.P. advocates are going to buy the capitalist class out. And, seeing that the capitalist class comprise about one-ninth of the population, and actually own nine-eighths of the wealth, we must admire the pluck and determination of our I.L.P. friends.

In reference to Trade Unions, one has only to look at the various books of rules to find there is the condemnation. It is stated, quite clearly in many of them, that the workers and masters should come together in harmony and for co-operation. Many of the Trade Union leaders try to carry this idea out (see Smith's on output, and the opportunists, Brace and Hartshorn, in their latest moves). Then, again, the present Trade Union Movement is a reformist movement, and only aims, at best, for an increase in wages, or, more seldom, a decrease in working hours. Incidentally, I would like to call attention to the fact that thousands of miners have not received their full amount of strike pay yet. This will go to prove that the miners can never hope to win by relying on their strike pay and doing nothing. The same applies to other workers. Something more than strike pay is necessary to beat our unscrupulous capitalists. Let us see what that something is. First of all, we had best get down to the root of the existing evils.

Causes of the Evils Under Capitalism.

To find the causes of the evil we must examine the system under which we live—Capitalism. Karl Marx, the founder of scientific Socialism, who put Socialism on a scientific basis and gave an interpretation to political economy that has never been refuted, proved without doubt that the evils that exist are inseparable from capitalism, are inherent to it. He tears aside the veil and lays bare the true position of the worker in capitalist society. The workers' status in capitalist society is one of the fundamentals of the social problem that confronts us. Marx proves scientifically that the worker today is only a commodity, only functions as a commodity, is bought and sold on the market as such, subject to the same conditions of supply and demand, and his value determined like that of all other commodities. There is one difference: he is a value-creating commodity. He has brains and muscle which the capitalist buys in order to become richer. Let us quote Marx: "In order to be able to extract value from the consumption of a commodity, our friend, Moneybags, must be so lucky as to find, within the sphere of circulation, in the market, a commodity, whose use-value possesses the peculiar property of being a source of value, whose actual consumption, therefore, is itself an embodi-

ment of labour, and consequently a creation of value. The possessor of money does find on the market such a special commodity in capacity for labour or labour power."—*Capital*, chapter 6.

This special commodity is the worker. He owns his labour power; he cannot be divorced from it. When the capitalist buys this labour-power, he buys the worker who possesses it. "Let us now examine more closely this peculiar commodity, labour power," says Marx. "Like all others it has a value."

The value of labour power is determined, as in the case of every other commodity, by the labour-time necessary for the production, and, consequently also the reproduction of this special article.

For his maintenance the worker requires a given quantity of the means of subsistence. Therefore the labour-time requisite for the production of labour-power reduces itself to that necessary for the production of those means of subsistence; in other words, the value of labour power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of the labourer." So we see the capitalist pays the worker his value as a commodity, but the worker, in producing, creates more than his value. This extra value created, Marx calls surplus-value, and Moneybags pockets this. So we see the worker is robbed—legally, of course—in the workshop. No value is created by exchange of commodities. All value is created in the workshop, mine or shipyard, etc., and that is where Moneybags appropriates it. To sum up, the worker is engaged by the capitalist, for the specific purpose of being robbed of the fruits of his labour. Under capitalism the worker is a commodity, something less than man or woman, and a commodity he or she is doomed to be while the blight of capitalism lasts. We find in studying the capitalist system of production that the working day is divided, broadly speaking, into two parts. The worker applies his labour power until he has produced his own value as a commodity. He does not finish work at this point—he goes on. If it takes four hours in which to do this, and the length of the working day is eight hours, then for four hours the worker labours for nothing, because the result is the surplus-value appropriated by Moneybags. In this division of the working day we have the cause of the class struggle; the workers ever striving for increased wages to retain their commodity value, and the capitalist class ever striving for profit. Profit and wages, coming from the same source, the labour of the worker, it can clearly be seen that the workers, ever seeking an increase, causes strife, while the constantly improved methods of production throw back the worker to his former position. Thus we have class antagonism.

Reformist Failures.

We now can more easily understand why reform movements are of necessity bound to be failures. They are unscientific. Based upon fallacies, they tragically endeavour to cope with modern capitalism, with the inevitable result that capitalism comes out of every struggle triumphant. For if, for instance, a trade union manages to secure a rise in wages, the process that goes on under capitalism behind the producer's back, so to speak, puts our old friend Moneybags back to his old position again. When hours of labour are reduced, this process going on, and labour-saving devices introduced, brings Moneybags again on top. An increase of wages or a decrease in hours does not emancipate the worker from his commodity status. Indeed, if any worker takes the trouble to review his position over a number of years, he will find, that in spite of all the wage increases, he is not one whit better off. Relatively he is worse now than ever he has been. Trade Unions, as at present constituted, are hopeless failures.

The State.

It, too, is hopeless so far as the workers are concerned. It is the executive committee of the capitalist class. The State only exists because class antagonisms manifest themselves, and are irreconcilable. As Lenin says, in his book "The State and Revolution": "It is precisely on this most important and fundamental point that distortions of Marxism arise along two main lines. On the one hand, the middle class (bourgeois), and particularly the lower middle class (petty bourgeois), ideologists, are compelled by the pressure of indisputable historical facts to recognise that the State only exists where there are class antagonisms and class struggles, 'correct' Marx in such a way as to make it appear that the State is an organ for the reconciliation of classes. According to Marx, the State can neither arise nor maintain itself if a reconciliation of classes is possible. According to Marx, the State is the organ of class domination, the organ of oppression of one class by another. Its aim is the creation of order which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the collisions between the classes. . . . On the other hand, the distortion of Marx by the Kautsky school is far more subtle. 'Theoretically,' there is no denial that the State is the organ of class domination or that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable, but what is forgotten or overlooked is this: If the State is the product of the irreconcilable character of class antagonisms, if it is a force standing above society and 'separating itself gradually from it,' then it is clear that the liberation of the oppressed classes is impossible without a violent revolution and without the destruction of the machinery of State power, which has been created by the governing class and in which this 'separation' is embodied."

So that if we study the Marxian solution of the social problem, we find that the only function the State can perform is that of "perpetuating" the oppression of the wage-earners. Therefore, La-

bour M.P.s, or any other kind of M.P., no matter what his label may be, cannot serve the working-class by entering the national gas-house. Then the question arises, what must be done in order that the workers be emancipated from their slavery, from their commodity status.

The Emancipation of the Workers.

The emancipation of the workers can only be accomplished by themselves. "He who would be free, he himself must strike the blow," and the workers must unite and confront the capitalist class as their avowed enemy. They must be in clear-cut opposition to capitalism and all its bulwarks, and its legal structures. This involves definite anti-parliamentary action. The capitalist system is in its dying struggles. It has had its day and served its purpose, but just as other systems died out, so must capitalism. We must admit it is pretty vigorous to be in a dying condition, but its vigour is only its brute force intensified, and only proves the desperate position it is in. Capitalism is a social system of mismanagement and must be replaced by a system which will be conducive to the well-being of the whole of the human race. The proletariat is the only class that can take this responsibility upon its shoulders. It is the only class fitted to do so, and in accomplishing this fulfils its historic mission. The Communist Party is the only party that can lead the workers to emancipation, for it is the advance guard of the workers, and only takes within its ranks those who fight consciously for the application of the Communist programme. It is definitely anti-parliamentary, and has a legal structure of its own, organised on the Soviet principle. The duty of the Communist Party is to form a network of groups in Great Britain, and link up, forming a nucleus, of the future working-class organisation. Up to the revolution the Communist Party must urge the workers to organise in one Union, which embraces the entire industries of the country. We learn much from the Russian Revolution, and a study of Comrades Lenin and Trotsky's works, not forgetting other Russian revolutionaries' works, will do much to enlighten us as to what ought to be done. One thing is certain, the Capitalist State must be abolished, that is, the "bourgeois dictatorship" must be abolished, and in its place we of necessity must have the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." This Dictatorship is necessary, for a strict guard must be kept on the workers' interests, and any attempt on the part of the dispossessed bourgeois to rear its head in any shape or form must be ruthlessly suppressed. Thus will private ownership be abolished and in its place social ownership established.

Good education work is being done in this direction by the Central Labour College, and wherever classes are established, all workers who can should attend. Marxian Economics and Industrial History are taught, and the pupil benefits much by the study of these subjects in that he will be more able to understand his to-day degraded position as a commodity, and know the history of the struggles of the working-class up to the present day. Having acquired this knowledge, his sense of the injustice of his position will surely spur him to end the accursed system of Capitalism and all the miseries it entails.

NEWS FROM INDIA.

Reports from India show that the first All-India Trades Union Congress, held at Bombay under the Presidency of Lala Lajpat Rai, was a great success. Lajpat Rai vigorously denounced "the oppression, degradation, and injustices" under which Indians suffered, and contrasted the lavishness with which English members of the Indian Civil Service are paid with the mean wages paid by the Government to the postal workers. He declared that Indians had come to the conclusion that they could place no more faith in British statesmanship, and must rely upon themselves.

Colonel and Mrs. Wedgwood were present. Col. Wedgwood appealed for the formation of well-organised Trades Unions and the avoidance of wild, loosely-prepared strikes.

A resolution was carried condemning the attitude of the employers towards the Bombay strikers, and a deputation was sent to the Governor of Bombay asking him to intervene. Mr. Baptista, one of the Bombay National leaders, denounced the unsympathetic attitude of the employers and of the Government.

A Standing Committee was appointed to manage the affairs of the Congress during the coming year, and to further the cause of the workers, until a permanent constitution for the Trade Union movement is adopted.

The wave of industrial unrest in India is still spreading, and 4,500 workers on the great Indian Peninsula Railway have struck work, and there is also a big strike among the mill-workers of Madras. The printers of the "Korachi Daily Gazette" have also struck, with the result that the paper is not appearing. The Bombay correspondent of the "Times" states that the employers are assuming "a more stiff-necked attitude."

Trafalgar Square Demonstration.

The National Executive is now actively making arrangements for a gigantic Trafalgar Square demonstration on Sunday, December 12th, to protest against these arrests and savage sentences. All supporters of Soviet Russia are asked to prepare to rally on this occasion.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia and the World Revolution. By N. BUKHARIN.

I.

COMMUNISM IN THE DOMAINS OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.

Our critics in the "Socialist" camp, often censure the Soviet Government on the ground that the "official Communism" of the Bolsheviks is nothing more than a communism of distribution. The Soviet power, say these critics, has merely effected a universal dividing-up; it has shared out housing accommodation, furniture, clothing, food, etc. On the other hand, the chief task of true Communism, should be the organisation of production. The Bolsheviks, we are told, think chiefly of organising distribution. By degrees, they transform the proletariat, which has hitherto been a class of producers, into a non-working class (idle owing to lack of fuel and other raw materials), pensioned by the State. The proletariat becomes a social stratum resembling the proletariat of classical Rome, supported by doles.

How much truth is there in all this, and how much falsehood? What should be the relationship, from the Marxist outlook, between the Communism of production and the Communism of distribution.

It is obviously impossible to deny that the Soviet Government has taken various steps in the direction of expropriation, not merely of the means of production, but likewise of the means of distribution. Typical instances of such measures are the installation of the workers and their organisations in bourgeois dwelling-houses; and rationing by class, that is to say, the assigning of larger food rations to members of the proletariat. But only one who is absolutely ignorant of the specific conditions in which the International Revolution is developing could possibly maintain that these measures are unjust. Marxism is founded upon the theory of the increase of productive forces in human society. As we have shown in the previous article, it does not follow that we need dread a transient decline in the forces of production, a decline which is absolutely inevitable in the course of the Revolution. By parity of reasoning, our chief aim, the organisation of production, may require, as a stage in its fulfilment, the communism of distribution to which our critics refer.

The Revolution, as a historical fact, has originated amidst the overwhelming devastation resulting from the Imperialist war. As everyone knows, this devastation, has in large part, taken the form of the destruction of enormous reserves of productive forces. Now what do these productive forces, which are the foundation of all progress, represent in the world of concrete reality? In part they are the means of production, and in part, they are the labour power of the workers. The productive forces do not consist of machines merely, but, in addition, they consist of the workers, the working class. Marx has shown more than once, that in contemporary society, the proletariat is the most important of all the forces of production. It is easy to understand that if the Revolution, at its outset, inevitably involves a still further depression in the forces of production, we must do all that is humanly possible to safeguard, to maintain, to preserve from utter ruin, this most important element in the forces of production, the working class itself. The preservation of the working class is an indispensable condition for the reconstruction of the productive apparatus of society.

The bourgeoisie endeavours to throw the whole cost of the war upon the working-class. In relation to the powers of the workers, the economic system of the bourgeoisie is what the Germans call "Raubwirtschaft,"—robber economy. But, as a matter of course, a Proletarian Government must make titanic efforts to maintain the power of the workers intact. During the period of unparalleled impoverishment, in which our resources have been so terribly reduced, there is only one way in which this task can be performed. The proletariat must be placed in a privileged economic position,

or must at least be enabled to live quite as well as the hungry bourgeois. All that is possible must be done for the proletariat in order to make up for the prevailing insufficiency of food, clothing and shelter. If, for a brief period, it should prove impossible to continue the productive supply of food, clothing, and shelter (and the impossibility, in existing circumstances, is obvious), there remains only one alternative. The objects of distribution must be re-allotted among the various classes. There must be a compulsory expropriation of these articles, and a proper supply of the proletariat must be organised. In short, we must practise the "Communism of Distribution."

In practising this Communism of distribution, our ultimate aim is to promote the development of the forces of production. In other words, during this period of impoverishment and famine, the so-called Communism of distribution is a necessary stage on the way to "true" Communism, on the way to productive Communism.

As a matter of course, the lower middle class must not be affected by this expropriation. It is equally a matter of course that in the colossal upheaval of the Revolution, there have been thousands of instances in which this rule has been broken. Yet no one but a pedant would "repudiate the Revolution" simply because the Revolution had not been achieved with that perfect orderliness we might desiderate.

To sum up: the concrete conditions of our time, the widespread impoverishment that exists, compel us to expropriate the means of distribution, no less than the means of production. The working class is the fundamental force of production, and the expropriation of the means of distribution is essential to the preservation of the working class.

II.

THE PROLETARIAN AND MILITARIST CHARACTER OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION.

We come at length to a series of questions which are closely interconnected. We are accused of a variety of sins. It is said that we make an improper use of the power of our Party, that we are "oligarchs"; we are terrorists; we practise Socialism of a militarist type. (The last accusation is quaint in the mouth of Imperialist and Royalist Socialists; etc.). We need not waste time over the abusive epithets or other labels employed by our opponents. Nevertheless, we do not for a moment deny that our apparatus is rigidly centralised; that our policy towards the bourgeoisie and towards the parties of the compromising Socialists is repressive in character; that the organisation of our own Party, as a ruling Party which exercises a dictatorship through the Soviets, is of a militarist type. To the pedant, these things may appear monstrous crimes; but they must be sacred laws of action for every revolutionist who has to work under the conditions imposed by circumstances upon our Party.

At this very moment, the Russian proletariat is the object (I use Churchill's own words), of a concentric attack on the part of fourteen states. But if we reckon up all the states which are at war with us, directly or indirectly, the number of these brigand organisations is considerably larger. If we superadd the "national" and declared counter-revolution, we arrive at a force of considerable magnitude. In these circumstances, the Soviet Republic is perforce an entrenched camp, and the dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily take the form of a proletarian and militarist dictatorship. It would be impossible for us to countenance any disintegrating elements within the sphere of our rule; we are compelled to maintain military discipline throughout the country and in all departments of the administration. This explains everything. Those among the intellectuals who are swayed by foolish sentimentality, those in whom the severities of the great struggle arouse

a shudder, those who are filled with fear mingled with disgust, are unremitting in their attacks against the proletarian regime—for the simple reason that they are utterly unable to understand the conditions of the struggle, and the active will which the historical conditions demand of us. The best illustration of the need for such a regime is furnished by the organisation of our own Party. Everyone of its members considers himself mobilised for active service. At the first summons of our Central Committee, the member of our Party, wherever he may be, must go to the post assigned to him. He must leave his family and make his way to the front, rifle on shoulder; or he must do observation work from an aeroplane over the enemy lines; or he must visit one of the enemy countries; or must give up nights and days to whatever he is ordered to undertake. In these respects, there is no difference between military and civil life.

For instance, in order to increase the productivity of labour, the members of our Party work overtime, or work on holidays, forming special Communist detachments: they load wood, unload trucks, labour in factories and workshops, setting an example of a new fraternal discipline. Nothing of the kind has ever been known before, and nothing of the kind is possible as yet outside Russia. Here it is absolutely necessary. And for every violation of this Party discipline there are strict and extremely disagreeable penalties.

From these considerations we may draw a number of conclusions. It is obvious that we cannot give a free hand to an "opposition" which, in the situation that now obtains, could within twenty-four hours transform itself into a counter-revolution. Such an opposition must be ruthlessly crushed.

Compromise here would only result in the internal disorganisation of the whole apparatus. Free controversy, in conditions such as now prevail in Russia, would not lead to the "truth" but to the victory of the counter-revolution.

In like manner, at the front, where a predetermined plan has to be carried out, and where rapid action is essential, we cannot tolerate "discussion" of the Parliamentary type. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same reasoning applies to many other branches of our activity, applies because the Soviet Republic is an entrenched camp.

But will a dictatorship of this sort be permanently requisite? Certainly not. The acuteness of its form depends upon the situation of the Soviet Republic in relation to the outer world.

Just as the terrorist policy of the Montagnards was justified by the position of the French Republic at home and abroad (a fact which Kautsky, "the historian," would do well to call to mind), so the Russian Soviet power, if it had failed to set up a regime intolerable to weak-nerved individuals, would have been an opportunist lamb, and would long have been torn to pieces by the Imperialist wolf.

Before the War, the comparison of the fighting proletariat to an army aroused no criticism. We used to speak of the "proletarian army," of the "soldiers of the revolution," and so on. Yet now that the movement has come when in stern reality, and no longer merely on paper, we have to be the soldiers of the revolution, many of these sometime soldiers prove to be deserters and strike-breakers, while not a few (nay, the majority as far as the Social-Democrats are concerned) actually find their way into the camp of our foes.

It is perfectly clear that as soon as the pressure from without is relieved, as may and should result from the international revolution, the forms of the dictatorship will be "mitigated."

Ultimately, when our enemies have been rendered powerless once for all, when they have mingled with the ranks of the workers, these enemies will become citizens. They will acquire equal rights with the workers of proletarian status. That status itself will then cease to exist, being insensibly replaced by a Communist society which knows nothing of status or class.

TWO "BRICKIES" AND A DINNER-HOUR TALK.

By JOHN STEELE.

"Hello, Bill, got yer pipe agoin'. What about them big Labour men and their 'dekerations.'? Do you say they get them 'ere titles to mislead us."

"That is so, Bert. You see, as things are to-day, society is made up of two classes: the Boss class and we who are called the working-class, and who are at war with them—an economic war called the class-war."

"But we are not fighting each other."

"Oh, yes, we are, and our interests are just as much opposed as were the interests of the German Bosses opposed to the British Bosses. We, who are workers, want the highest wage we can get. We join Trade Unions to help keep up our wages; we may go to another town where workers are scarce and the bosses offer a higher wage; when we think we have a chance of winning we may even go on strike, all to get more money so that we may be able to save a little for a rainy day, or that we might be able to secure a few more home comforts. The Bosses, on the other hand, form unions called a Federation of Employers, a Master Bakers' Union or a Union of Master Builders, as the case may be. They meet and discuss how to prevent wages from rising; they may decide to lock out the workers; they will call the Press to their assistance, employ politicians, parliament, and the government, all with the object of forcing down the workers' wages. That struggle between the bosses and the workers is the class-war, and that fight goes on in every country."

"So that's 'eckinomics,' is it? But the 'Empire' bloke as spoke at the meeting the other night said as we workers and the gov'nors were brothers, and the gov'nor was our big brother, for he found us work and paid us our wages for the work we done."

"Just so, Bert, that is part of the war—propaganda by the 'Empire Union' and other capitalist parties, supported by the bosses to keep us contented, to divide us against each other that we may not go on strike, that we may vote them into Parliament, that we may not listen to our own mates when they talk of Socialism. All part of the struggle, Bert, just to prevent unity among the working-class."

"Unity! That's what our 'leaders' say; and these Big Labour Men as are in Parliament; and they are against the gov'nors and the 'Empire Union' blokes, yet you say these 'ere 'Labour leaders' are traitors to us workers!"

"Let me explain, Bert. I think you are beginning to understand things now, and you will soon be a Bolsh like the rest of us who are Communists, and are called 'wild men,' 'extremists,' etc., etc., by the Press, politician, and Labour leader alike. There never can be unity among the workers until we are agreed how best to fight our enemy—the capitalist. So we who are Communists, we who advocate the overthrowing of capitalism, the building up of a new society, based upon social ownership, must just continue to agitate at the street corners, in the factory, on the job where we work, in our Trade Unions and social clubs, to distribute literature, to try and interest our mates in the workers' cause until we get them to think out problems as we do. Then we will have unity and strength, and fight to win."

"Quite so, Bill; I agree with all that, and the Labour leaders when they go to the 'Parliament' can put all our troubles straight for us, and we won't need to strike for bigger wages and all that sort of thing. Yes, Bill, I can now see as you're right. It's unity as we want."

"Labour leaders, you say, can put things straight for us in Parliament! I am glad to see you making progress, but don't hurry so much, else you will get lost in the great labyrinth of politics. You are now in the second stage of progressive working-class thought. But this is just that transitory stage when the Labour leader is most active and just gives that opportunity to play his part in the interests of the Bosses. In the first stage, he who is discontented, he who is aware that all is not well, is kept in check by the clergy, the capitalist political reformer, the Empire League people, etc. In the second stage, when the worker begins to understand things and become class-conscious, when he, like a horse, begins to kick over the traces, the 'Labour fakir' can rein him in. He will 'make a show' of fighting the workers' battle. When the workers go on strike he will act as a peacemaker, make some flimsy compromise, urge the workers to drop the strike weapon, drive him back to work—all in the interest of the Boss."

"Now, Bill, this a-goin' on strike is what I get up against; we nearly always lose. The Bosses can beat us and our Labour men as sit in 'Parliament' won't have it; and if these 'ere Labour leaders betray us, we can turn 'em out and get others as will go straight."

"Like you, old chum, I do not put much reliance on strikes, but I have even less faith in Parliament. I am totally opposed to the use of the ballot-box."

"Bill, whatever are yer a-talkin' about? Would you not vote to send a genuine, straight Labour bloke to Westminster, or one of these 'ere 'Communist-revolution' men to fight the Bosses, that we working chaps could get better laws and higher wages?"

"There goes the hooter. But, just a minute. While placing these bricks in position this afternoon, try to realise that you are a wage-slave;

that you toil on for eight hours every day: six of these go to the boss as profit. He does not work. He lives in a big house. He owns a 'luxury' motor-car. He travels all over the world. He thoroughly enjoys life. He goes to Parliament, and to church of a Sunday. He owns the bricks, and that is why he can force you to work and keep him in comfort. He pays the 'Empire Union' speakers to hold the ballot-box before your eyes, that you might not think about the bricks."

"Our foodstuffs are not grown in Parliament or in Heaven. Our houses and railways are not built in Parliament, neither is the coal mined in Parliament. Our class-war against the Bosses is not fought out in Parliament—our fight is in the workshop, the factory, in the mine and upon the railroads. That is where we produce profit for the Bosses, that is where the robbery goes on, that is where the capitalist Boss has the power over us. HE OWNS THE BRICKS."

"Say, Bill, there goes the gov'nor. I see it all now. If we working chaps got hold of the bricks and railways, the factories and mines, the gov'nors would either work with us or starve. So that would be an end to Bosses and 'Parliament' and unemployment. As the Empire bloke says, a Revolution."

"Get out of it, Bill; the gov'nor, 'e's a-comin'."

PASSIVE v. POSITIVE FORCE.

By A. G. CRAWFORD.

I.

When the Rev. G. T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B., complains that neither Whitehead nor myself state "your case"—e.g. the Editor's whole philosophy of Communism—in between us, something like one column of the *Dreadnought*, an argument necessarily attenuated, and designed rather to meet his own simple illusions, than to state any case at all, this may seem a good dialectical point, though certainly it is not one which any master in arts or laws could, in sincerity or without egotism, care to make.

I, personally, do not know either the Editor or Whitehead. But I do know that whilst these and myself, being Communists, are fundamentally in agreement, it is now "up to" Mr. Sadler either to try to understand and support this "case," or, whilst fighting it, to support the other. To-day there is no half-way house—everyone is either for the spirit of D.O.R.A. and its successor, the Emergency Act, or against it—for freedom, and health, and a real manhood, or against all these. On the one side, is not the Labour Party or Trade Unions themselves a growth of the old and dead capitalist-parliamentary civilisation; but Communism, on the other side, is sheer self and social negation.

"Educate," says this mentor; "plan the new order reasonably," for "force only breeds force." Finally, besides exercising a passive, not positive, "moral resistance to evil," we are to put our "trust in the Man in men."

But how can we educate when to educate is a penal offence; how can we appeal to reason when the side of force and power is, as it is, necessarily opposed to and fearful of reason, and allied therefore to force only? Then, again, the cant that "force only breeds force," with its further implication that force *per se* is wrong and immoral, is simply not true. Force is energy. Life and thought and health are forms of energy and force. Passive, destructive, or negative forms of force are unnatural and wrong. On the other hand, every positive or constructive form of force is natural and right. At present Mr. Sadler's force is non-moral and passive. Mr. Lloyd George's, in turn, is immoral, active, negative and destructive. Only Communist force to-day is natural, destructive, designedly constructive, social, moral and positive. Then, once more, how can we put our trust in the god in man when the State, its Church and Press, all discourage that faith whilst themselves expressing, as right, not wrong, the supremacy of things and the beast in man?

Like the Premier, his "Government," and other of our "invulnerable" nothings, Mr. Sadler also fears and also refuses to face reality. For instance, he also fears what neither he nor any other man can escape—he fears "direct action." To will at all is direct action. But this willing, itself, like individual responsibility, inescapable, nevertheless, at our option, is either negative or positive—destructive or constructive—though in any case direct. To refuse to will is to will to refuse. The result of this, not running away, but running in a circle, is self and social negation. Not to fight evil with more than its, that is, with all nature's armoury, also is self and social negation. On the other hand, to refuse (even Authority) to fight for right, and against wrong, is self affirmation—the mark of a real, positive man. Not to refuse, on the contrary, is the mark of a chattel and a craven, at best a thing, in the likeness of man, which any man can buy. Like force, pacifism is right when its aim is moral, social, positive.

This, in part, is the Communist case. The *Nation*, in its leader, "The Call for Public Action," asks: "What is the answer of the British people?" Similarly the *Herald* observes: "Only Labour can do anything, will Labour act?"

In a further article I shall try to demonstrate that neither of these bodies can now answer or act in any positive, constructive sense, till, first, every ghost of an institution of our old dead and damned system (or civilisation) is finally destroyed. Transition in this case cannot be easy, for not we, but our half-men in power, of course using others, say that they at least will fight.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

By L. A. MOTLER.

I was watching Herbert. And Herbert was working. It is not often that I get the pleasure of seeing other people at work, whilst myself hang round with a bag and a question-list as long as anything. He was picking up small bits of metal from a series of small boxes or sections in a large shall case. He put these in a peculiar tool or container, which he held in his left hand.

"Having a game?" I asked.

"A which?" he queried, pausing momentarily.

"It looks like a game, anyhow," I said; "you just hunt up those bits of flat iron and set them in nice little rows. Woddercallit?"

"This," Herbert remarked, "is the ancient and honourable craft of typesetting, a branch of the ditto ditto printing trade. Any more squashtions?"

"What's that thingummy you got in your hand?"

He held it aloft. "This? It's a stick."

"Come along!"

"A composing stick, to be exact. With this marvellous instrument in my hand I compose type. Observe, ladies and gentlemen, there is no deception," and he bowed with mock solemnity.

Then he turned to picking up the pieces of spent shrapnel again. He said these were "type," that is to say, letters or characters, capitals and small letters. There were also small caps as he called them; and italics. There were two sets of forty-nine sections in the "upper case" and about as many in the "lower," so one had to have a memory for all of them. However, he said it was all in the day's work.

"What I object to, however," he remarked, "is the boss coming and nosing around. He gives me a job to comp., in Italian too, mind you. And before I am fairly started, he must come round and see as I am doing it properly. Takes me for a kindergarten in printing, most likely. He's out at the moment, as I told you just now, or I wouldn't be giving you a few chapters on 'Every Man His Own Printer.'"

"You seem to be going on all right," I put in, "in fact, it is rather astonishing how quickly you pick up those pieces of bent nail and put them in that stick, as you call it."

"Merely a matter of practice," he answered. "I don't go in for sweating, but just a comfortable rate with which any man ought to be satisfied; but when an ice-cream merchant goes into the printing business, you may guess it isn't all hokey-pokey. Told me the other day, he did, that I wasn't going fast enough. 'You know,' says old Spaghetti to me, 'what expenses I have to pay, and everything going up in a dreadful manner—that's his ice-cream accent, see? So I asked him what about me, with food going up every week and the pound value down to about seven bob pre-war. He throws out his hands and says how hard it is to get business. 'I am quite satisfactory,' says Macaroni, 'to pay you as much money as you did need, but we expect you to do more for it; I wished that I have that Italian comp.; oh, he was so clever.'"

Herbert threw out his hands in what I presume was to be taken as "Macaroni's" despairing attitude.

"Yes," he went on, "that's old him all over. So I says 'He was some smart comp., sure. That's why he left, I expect.' As a matter of fact I did not tell the old man that the Italian comp. came up to me and asked what the trade rate was, and I told him. The next day he cleared out; I guessed Spaghetti had been trying to put it across him. It's the same old tale, trying to grab what they can in a business—and the only everlasting way is cheap labour."

I agreed.

"Now, I need not tell you that the cost of printing has gone up 800 per cent., and I have seen it in a trade paper, which couldn't be said to be Bolsh, as it had a few parts on the 'hothead' strike in Manchester, as it termed that attempt to get decent wages, that the price was 900 per cent. Now, I ask you, what printing employee gets 800 per cent. on his pre-war wages? Nixes, I tell you. There is sure somebody bagging the loot. Most of it is put on paper, and the old man fairly weeps when he sees the paper-makers' bill; comes to me for sympathy, too. I suppose he expects me to fold him to my bosom and ask for a reduction in wages."

He got hold of the type-case and shook the lot about viciously. I expected to see it all come flying about the floor, but it was merely getting off steam.

"Yes," he went on, "and when some old fellow ice-cream came round with a subscription list for the Vittimy della terrormotor, as he called it, being that earthquake, you know, old Spaghetti planked down a fiver as cool as you please and took care to write his name big. You will find 'em all the same, these bosses; they always tell you they are being ruined by your wages, but somehow they are always able to make the sparked fly."

And just then Spaght—pardon, Felloni, came in.

NOW READY.

THE REVOLUTION TO-MORROW.

By L. A. MOTLER.

Copies of this pamphlet can be obtained from L. A. Motler, 47, Crownndale Road, London, N.W.1, and from the "Workers' Dreadnought" Office, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Price 2d. Post free 3d.

THE REVOLT AGAINST THE LABOUR BUREAUCRACY.

We have often pointed out the manner in which the Workers' Movement in this country is the easy prey of a whole hierarchy of grafters. We have also shown how "Graft" strengthens the self-regarding emotions, and weakens the other-regarding emotions in the evolution of character. To-day we will examine the causes of the widespread revolt against the Trade Union leaders, the surge of which becomes ever more menacing and widespread.

To do this we will put forward a short analysis of what is referred to vaguely as "the working class." We find that in reality it is not a coherent class at all, but rather consists of several "classes," somewhat as follows:—

Class 1.—Labour Leaders at £20 per week.

The members of this class are, in actual fact, CAPITALISTS. Their incomes place them in possession of exploiting capital to invest, and thenceforth live on the labour of actual workers.

Class 2.—Labour Leaders at £10 per week.

The members of this class are in reality members of the "Petit Bourgeois" class. Their incomes place them in this class. They live in somewhat better class neighbourhoods, although they do not quite aspire to mansions at Dulwich, and they are able to give their children somewhat superior education and see that such children are able to avoid real work; and they have, in most cases, small investments and share capital which gives them a small proportion of unearned income.

Class 3.—Skilled Workers at £5 to £7 weekly.

The members of this class are generally genuine proletarians, although their return for their labour is beginning to approximate to its true value. As a class they are, therefore, moderately contented and conservative in outlook.

Class 4.—Workers at £3 10s. to £5 weekly.

This is the great class of the organised worker and the great strength and urge to social justice is dominant throughout the class. The members of this class receive in return about half the product of their labour. They are acutely conscious that social brigandage pilfers the other half by means of the Great Money Trick, and that this other half of the product of their labour is to be found on the backs of chattering hordes of over-dressed women who parade Bond Street and the West End, on the tables and in the bottles of the diners at the Ritz, the Carlton, and the Savoy, in the furnishings and structure of the palatial "mansions" dotted all over the country, in the Rolls-Royces, Crossleys, and other luxury vehicles of the shameful rich, and so forth.

Class 5.—Wage Workers at £2 to £3 10s weekly.

In this class, the surplus value fleeced is somewhat greater than in the above class, and the revolutionary tendencies are more marked.

Class 6.—Workers at less than £2 weekly.

These are the bottom dogs from which the sansculottes of our English Revolution will spring. In general, this class has thrown off most of its self-respect, and, in language and demeanour, clearly demonstrates that it is the policeman's baton that alone keeps it from taking its social revenge.

Now here we get no less than six quite distinct and clearly-marked classes, sharply divided from each other by differences of income.

The whole fundamental of Marxism goes to show that

"the ideas and interests of a man are conditioned by (a) the amount of his income, and (b) the manner of getting it."

From (a) then we see clearly that the class interests, and the class ideas, of each of these six classes MUST DIFFER FUNDAMENTALLY FROM EACH OTHER. In classes 4, 5, and 6, the size of the pieces of bread and margarine begin to get smaller, the quality of the shoddy begins to get more ragged and hence the revolutionary ardour for justice strengthens.

And right here, I want to point out that the class to which a man belongs is determined much more by his income than by his birth. Marx and Lenin by income belonged for years to about class 4. They were, therefore, true proletarians. War profiteers, even if born in the gutter, are placed by their incomes among the capitalists. Therefore their ideas and their interests are conditioned by such incomes, and they are truly capitalists despite their dubious birth.

We have clearly pointed out, then, that the Labour Movement in this country has been placed in the hands of men who, by their incomes, must rapidly acquire bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideology. What can be expected from such a movement but betrayal, confusion, and misdirection?

The incomes, and manner of earning them, of the Labour leader class, make for Labour leader class interests, such as industrial peace, so that the work of milking the membership may go on more smoothly, conciliation and arbitration, negotiation and compromise, so that more jobs for Labour leaders may be found, more limelight, more publicity, and therefore what else can be expected but that the leaders should back parliamentarism, and Whiteley Councils, and such-like nonsense?

The fault for this state of affairs lies with the workers, and it is a good sign that they are everywhere realising the position and preparing for a "sack the lot" policy of their leaders and grafters. Not only that, but they are preparing to abolish the system by which this scandal has come about, so

that when the present set of rascals are sacked, no fresh ones are appointed to be glutted with milk and honey.

Keep them in your class. Pay them exactly what you yourselves as wage-workers get. Make the conditions of their employment precisely what yours are, i.e. the "sack" at a week's notice.

Communist policy is always consistently directed from a keen appreciation of the realities of the class struggle. We have always advocated bringing up the wage of the Bottom Dog, bringing down the wage of the Bleeder, in a word, always moving in the direction of coalescing classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, into one solid class, by solidarity, based on equality of economic remuneration—equality in material things, based on equality of need for those things.

Let Vigilant Committees and groups of active workers therefore get together inside each Union to oust the bourgeois and petit bourgeois leaders, and to bring within each rule-book: "That the wages of every official of this society shall be paid weekly and be the average wage of the normal member of the Union."

Only when that first step is achieved will the workers' movement have that healthiness and virility to win out.

WHY THE HUNGARIAN SOVIET FELL

BELA KUN'S VIEW.

(Specially written for the *Workers' Dreadnought* by "A.T.")

It is well known that Bela Kun recently escaped from the White Terror to Soviet Russia, where he awaits a new and successful Communist revolution in his native Hungary.

He is emphatically of the opinion that the fall of the Soviet Government in Hungary was due first of all to the Entente, and especially to the British Government. The British representatives, Admiral Troubridge and Captain Freeman, were the centre of the counter-revolution.

A secondary cause of the fall was the lack of revolutionary experience of the Hungarian workers. Moreover, the Communist Party was too young for its great task, and it has been relatively too much a propaganda and too little a fighting and organising body.

When the Soviet Government was established, the ablest and best people in the Communist Party were either sent to the front or filled administrative posts. Propaganda and the political education of the masses was neglected. The Hungarian Communists did not realise as the Russians do, that this should be regarded as their first and most important work. Meanwhile the Social-Democrats and bourgeois politicians, who, having no responsibility of Government and defence, had all their forces free for anti-Communist propaganda.

The Communists did not take strong measures, as they should have done, to combat the counter-revolution, and the traitorous Social-Democrats successfully intrigued with the Entente Missions for the overthrow of the Soviet power.

Soviet Hungary built much hope on the demonstration of the Allied proletariat, which was to be given by the general strike of July 20th and 21st, 1919. As we know, the strike demonstration was a failure. The British Labour movement held a few unimportant public meetings, the French Labour leaders called off the strike at the last moment, the Italians alone kept their pledge. A great depression was felt in Hungary when it was shown by the failure of this demonstration that no help was to be looked for from the Allied workers.

But in any case, and whatever steps the Hungarian Communists might have taken, it is doubtful if they could have maintained their power at that time. The armies of the Entente encircled Budapest but sixty kilometres away.

The Hungarian workers and peasants made great sacrifices for the Communist Revolution. The Hungarian population was only 7,000,000, yet the Red Army numbered 240,000, and there were 40,000 Red Guards. The enthusiasm was such, that in two days 28 battalions of 800 men each were raised for the Red Army, when news came on May 2nd that the Czech and Roumanian Armies were but 45 miles from Budapest.

At that time the Social-Democrats Böhm, who was Commander-in-Chief, and Kunfi, who was Minister of Education, desired to flee and leave the enemy to enter Budapest unhindered. It was a mistake to unite in forming a government with the Social-Democrats, but the Communists were not numerous enough to act alone, and in the Soviet Congress the majority of the delegates were actually Social-Democrats.

It seems in fact a premature acceptance of power, premature because they were not yet strong enough to take power alone, which was the greatest mistake made by the Hungarian Communists.

Nevertheless, Bela Kun still considers the Communist taking of power in conjunction with the Social-Democrats to have been inevitable. If the Soviet Government had not been so early compelled to fight the Entente, the situation would have improved and the power of the Communists in the Government would have grown. The Entente attack began three weeks after the Soviets were set up, yet the Soviets were able to maintain themselves for four and a half months.

The economic organisation was so good that in many respects Soviet Hungary in its short life had gone further economically than Soviet Russia has yet done.

NATIONALISATION IN GERMANY.

Immediate and complete nationalisation of coal mines is recommended by the majority report of the special commission appointed to investigate the question of socialisation of German industries, made public last week.

All the members of the commission agreed that the elimination of capitalist profit in the coal-mining industry is indispensable. An imperial coal council, which would have complete control over the industry and which would turn over all profits to the State, is recommended in the majority report.

Mines would deliver their entire product to the Council, which would arrange deliveries and fix selling costs. It would have power to open, close or buy mines.

COMMUNIST PARTY
(Bow & Poplar Branches).

A DANCE

In aid of the "DREADNOUGHT" FUND will be held at

CROWN HALL (40, Redman's Road, Mile End),

on
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 16th, 1920,
Doors open at 6 p.m. Dancing from 6.30—12.

Tickets, 1s. 6d. each can be obtained from the "Workers' Dreadnought" office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

A Monthly for Proletarians.
The DECEMBER

PLEBS

includes articles on:—H. G. Wells on Marxism; Engels; Socialist Classics (the 18th Brumaire); Geographical Footnotes to Current History (Ireland); etc., etc., and Ten-Minutes' Talks with New Students; Students' Page, Book Reviews, Correspondence, etc.

6d. monthly (post paid, 7d.), from all Labour bookshops, or from Plebs, 11a, Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W. 8.

MALTHUSIANISM

BIRTH-CONTROL METHODS

by

PROFESSOR G. HARDY.

Translated from the 45th French Edition.
39 Illustrations.

Price 3s. 6d. post free.

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

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

J. W. GOTT, Secretary Liberator League,
61, Dorset Street, Bradford.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

ADVERTISER, qualified ACCOUNTANT, fluent Spanish, will do anything, or anyone, anywhere. MUST OBTAIN FUNDS.—Write (in confidence), "Disabled, c/o Workers' Dreadnought."

RUSSIAN CLASS (in Olive Beamish's Office), 92, Bishopsgate, on Fridays, 7—8 p.m. For terms apply Mrs. BOUVIER, 32, Mount Pleasant Road, Lewisham.

GRAMOPHONES FOR SALE, splendid Xmas presents; first-class quality; new; good Records.—Apply, Workers' Dreadnought Office.

FURNISHED BEDROOM and SITTING ROOM (piano), ground floor, suitable for two; with or without attendance.—32, Mount Pleasant Road, Lewisham. Good train, tram, and bus service.

EVERYONE interested in the question of ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM should read "THE FINNISH REVOLUTION," by O. V. Kuusinen, post free 3d., and an "OPEN LETTER TO LENIN," post free 1d. To be obtained from the Literature Secretary, 400, Old Ford Road, London, E. 8.

NATIONAL SECRETARY'S NOTES.

The Cardiff Conference.

By the time these notes are in print, Group Secretaries will be in possession of the final agenda for this Conference. There is every prospect of a valuable and fruitful Conference.

Two More Imprisonments.

Comrade R. V. Harvey, Secretary of the Birmingham Branch, and Comrade John Steele, Secretary of the Hyde Park International Branch, were arrested on Thursday, November 25th, and Friday, November 26th, respectively, and sentenced by the Birmingham Bench to four months' hard labour for speeches delivered in the Bull Ring, Birmingham, the previous week. The savagery of these sentences and the serious position in which the dependents of our comrades find themselves calls for the establishment of a Soviet Workers' Defence Committee without further delay, embracing all organisations supporting the Third International, so that the right of free speech on Communism may be established, funds provided to fight cases in the courts and to conduct appeals where advisable, and maintenance provided for the dependents of those victims of the British White Terror. This time it is our own organisation which has been hit. Another time it may be our Maiden Lane comrades or the Scottish comrades. The National Executive is making arrangements to approach all kindred organisations so that this defence committee may be properly constituted and set up without delay. Meanwhile immediate funds are needed for the support of the wife and child of our Comrade Steele, and the dependents of Comrade Harvey. Trade Union branches who have at heart the welfare of Soviet Russia, and the propagation of the Soviet ideals in this country, are specially asked to make donations to this fund from their incidental funds. Cheques and orders should be sent temporarily to Edgar T. Whitehead, 8, Sinclair Gardens, W. 14, and will be acknowledged in these columns, all such donations being ultimately incorporated in the funds of the Defence Committee.

Do the Theses and Statutes Insist on Revolutionary Parliamentarism?

In order to fully consider this very vital question, the answer to which will certainly have a great bearing on our Cardiff Conference, let us take the extract from the thesis which brings the point specially home.

"In this way, while recognising as a general rule the necessity of participating in the elections to the central parliament, and the institutions of local self-government, as well as in the work of such institutions, the Communist Party must decide the question concretely, according to the specific conditions of the given moment. Boycotting the elections of the Parliament, or leaving the Parliament, is permissible, chiefly when there is a possibility for an immediate transition to an armed fight for power."

I claim that this paragraph answers the query at the head of this article, and answers it in an emphatic negative. Boycotting the elections of parliament is permissible chiefly, etc., etc. It is then also permissible under some other condition besides the "chiefly." I am claiming it is then permissible for Britain at this juncture. And I am claiming it is permissible on the ground of the very special conditions which happen to exist in this country and which do not exist in any other of the countries which have parties affiliated to the Third International. Let us briefly review these special conditions. Firstly we read (page 47) that the Communist campaign must be carried "by the entire mass of the party members, not by the leaders alone."

A united Communist Party for Britain next year may number something like six thousand members. This gives an average of something like ten party members per parliamentary constituency. There is certainly going to be a fearful debacle when these ten members advance in mass formation to capture the parliamentary seat! Even in those fortunate constituencies which possess something more than the average, even up to one hundred or one hundred and fifty party members, nothing very alarming would happen in a mass tactic at the election. Secondly comes the point of whether the parliamentary tactic is important. It may be unimportant, and is unimportant from its viewpoint on the progress of the class-war. But it is going to be very important on the question of the development of the Communist Party here.

Parliamentary elections are very costly things, and such work is going to make a very important hole in party finance. Waste of good gold, which might be better used. To speak of a tactic as "unimportant," when possibly three-fourths of party finance, three-fourths of party energy, and attention are swallowed up by it, is certainly not very far-seeing.

Thirdly, and this is a point which I do not think has ever been urged before in considering this question, we have to consider the extraordinary traditional British pacifism in regard to all political struggles. This pacifism is largely the result of Manchester Liberalism. I do not recollect a single instance in this country where the "fighting" for a parliamentary seat has resulted in anything more alarming than a rotten egg. I do not recall a single other country where political struggles are not carried on in very different fashion. Here, we are so instilled with the idea that the "weapon" is the "vote," and that "votes" are the only real "force," that to combat this extraordinary delusion of mixing up the shadow with the substance, it is necessary to make it clear everywhere that a vote

(Continued at bottom of column 3.)

COMMUNIST PARTY

British Section of the Third International.

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

MINIMUM WEEKLY SUBSCRIPTION: Threepence.

Entry Fee: One Shilling.

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

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

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

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

BRANCH NOTES.

Hammersmith.

Thursday's meeting at the Grove was very well attended. Our special thanks are due to Comrade McConnell for coming to speak at very short notice. Branch meetings are held Fridays at 8 p.m., at 152, Goldhawk Road, Shepherd's Bush, and Comrade Secretary Birch will be glad to have the names of further recruits to keep the banner of Communism flying in Hammersmith. Letters to Minnie Birch, 10, South Street, Kang Street, Hammersmith, W. 6.

Birmingham.

The Secretary, Comrade Robert Harvey, is in Birmingham Gaol undergoing a sentence of four months' hard labour. It is alleged that he urged the workers to seize the factories and workshops.

Swansea.

This Branch is holding well together, and gets in a good deal of propaganda. All Swansea Communists are asked to communicate with the Secretary, Comrade E. Penny, 60, Alexandra Road, Swansea. It is not enough to sympathise with Soviet Russia or to believe in Soviet Russia, it is necessary to work for the establishment of a Soviet Britain.

Poplar.

Comrade Walker, Branch Secretary, handed in her resignation on Thursday last, because she wants to give her whole time to propaganda and building up the organisation. Comrade Dunne was elected Secretary in her stead, and there is no doubt Poplar Branch has the right man in the right place.

Organising the Unemployed.

It was decided, owing to the demand of the local unemployed ex-servicemen and others, to call a public meeting in the Town Hall, for the purpose of organising the unemployed. Poplar unemployed will soon be well to the front and take their stand by their comrades in Shoreditch, Islington, Camberwell and Hackney. Will speakers desiring to help Comrade Walker communicate with her at 158, East India Dock Road, Poplar, E. 14. "Wherever there are ten proletarians, there should be a nucleus for a branch of the Communist Party." (With these words from the thesis as our guide, we cannot go wrong. All Poplar rebels desiring to work for Communism are asked to communicate with Comrade Dunne, 20, Railway Street, Poplar, E. 14.)

Hyde Park International.

The Secretary, Comrade John Steele, is now undergoing four months' hard labour in Birmingham Gaol. His crime is that he is alleged to have echoed the sentences of Comrade Malone's speech at the Albert Hall. Comrade E. Thomas, 75, Marylands Road, Maida Vale, is acting as Secretary during our Comrade's enforced absence.

GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

Porth Comrades 12s, Hammersmith Comrades 9s 4d, Exeter Comrades 6s 8d, D. Roodzant 10s, Staines Comrades 6s 8d, Poplar Comrades £1, Swansea Comrades 7s.

is not a weapon, and that it is not by a fight with votes that the Communist International expects to carry through the world revolution. I claim that this could be best instilled by "repudiating" the vote, at least for some years, until clear thinking on this subject resulted. If we fight with votes, innumerable workers are bound to be deluded into the belief that we expect to "win" with votes, or that "votes" are an essential weapon, and, as all the Labour Party fakirs are assiduously fostering the same delusion, the effect on the proletariat of our political antics will be very misleading. "Action," "Mass Action," and "Direct Action" are to be the battle-cries of Communist propaganda, and not "Votes," "Mass Votes," and "Direct Votes."

The great task before the United British Communist Party will be organisation. Wherever there are ten proletarians to get a Communist nucleus, a group must be formed. In place of six thousand members, we must aim at sixty thousand members, and then six hundred thousand. The right sort of members will not be attracted by a "voting" programme. Until the sixty thousand mark is reached, at least, all voting should be taboo and all energies and funds go to perfecting and building up the organisation. As to the question of whether the thesis binds Britain to revolutionary parliamentarism, I answer an emphatic NO. The drafters of the thesis neither understood the peculiar British psychology, the peculiar British pacifism, nor the impossibilities of revolutionary parliamentarism here nearly so well as we Communists on the spot understand these matters. Let us get down to the realities of the organisation of force. Let the Labour Party carry on with the organisation of mere votes. It is the crucial difference between us.

LONDON MEETINGS: OUTDOOR.

Whitechapel.

Osborne Street, Sundays, at 11.45 a.m.

Poplar.

Dock Gates, Sundays, at 7 p.m.

Camberwell.

Saturdays, at Hanover Park, Rye Lane, at 7.30. Sundays, Peckham Rye, at 11 a.m.

Hammersmith.

The Grove. Every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Willesden.

Manor Park Road, Fridays.

Birmingham.

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

Barking.

Near Barking Station. Sundays at 6.30 p.m. Communist speakers.

INDOOR BRANCH MEETINGS.

Soho International.

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

Bow.

400, Old Ford Road. Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.

Poplar.

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

Camberwell.

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

Hull.

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

Hammersmith.

Branch meetings held Fridays, at 8 p.m., at 152, Goldhawk Road, Shepherd's Bush, W.

Barking.

Thursdays, at 8 p.m. At "Glenhurst," Ripple Road, Barking, E.

Stepney.

Branch meetings held Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at the I.S.C., 28, East Road, City Road, N. 1.

HYDE PARK PROPAGANDA GROUP.

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

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

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

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

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

IN CONFERENCE.

Communist Comrades of South Wales.

Districts represented:—Merthyr (H. Griffiths), Dowlais (J. S. Williams), Cardiff (Pope), Tonyrefail (A. Harding), Porth and District (T. Thomas, F. Burt, and W. O. Jones), Penrhywceiber (Phil Thomas), Mardy (A. Horner), Ferndale (Midwinter and Jones), Ogmore Vale (E. J. Howell), Port Talbot (D. Benetta), Abercynon (J. Dicks), Barry (J. Jones).

Fraternal delegates from the Communist Party of Great Britain (A. E. Cook, J. Warren, and Chappell).

Nominated to the chair (T. J. Watkins).

The question of unity was discussed at length, and it was resolved:—

- (1) That this Conference, representing South Wales' revolutionary element, can only attain unity by having local autonomy in given local areas.
- (2) That we recommend all bodies represented to attend the Conference on December 4th and support the above resolution as the only method of unity, and force capitalism to get out.
- (3) That the Secretary write both Communist parties asking why the South Wales Comrades have not been invited to sit on the unity executive at Manchester.

PRIMARY EDUCATION IN RUSSIA.

At the third session of the Moscow Central Executive Committee, the Commissar of Public Instruction has given the details of the steady increase of primary schools. The number has grown from 55,000 in 1911, and 73,000 in 1918, to 87,000 in 1920. The schools are attended by five million children.

Printed at the Agenda Press (T.U.), 10, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4, and Published by the Communist Party at 153, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.