

Havelock Wilson P.C. 5.

Workers' Dreadnought

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by
SYLVIA FANEHURST

Look
out
for
our
next
issue.

VOL. IX. No. 30.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7th, 1922.

Weekly—PRICE ONE PENNY.

WAR STILL THREATENS.

LONDON DOCKERS REFUSE TO LOAD TROOPSHIP.

LABOUR LEADERS SHARE THE GUILT OF WAR PREPARATIONS.

OBSOLETE TRADE UNIONS.

IMPERIALIST LABOUR PARTY POLICY. THE REMEDY WORKERS' SOVIETS.

COMMUNISM THE ONLY CURE FOR WAR.

War still threatens; the causes which have led to the massing of British and Turkish Armies still remain. The struggle for control of the Straits, for Thrace, and for Turkish oil still continues.

The "Daily Herald," on Monday, October 2nd, declared positively that war had been averted owing to the statesmanship of General Harington, M. Franklin-Bouillon, and Mustapha Kemal. As for General Harington, we only know that he is a General fighting on behalf of British Capitalism, and we are not disposed to aid in the work of making a national hero of him on such flimsy showing as that which has satisfied the "Daily Herald." As for M. Franklin-Bouillon, he is commonly described in France as a filibuster; and as for Mustapha Kemal, when Britain is officially at war with him he may look in vain to the "Daily Herald" for compliments, or even for fair treatment.

The "Daily Herald" was, unfortunately, unable to claim that the Labour Party has done anything to avert war.

Not a Man, Not a Gun, Not a Ship.

This slogan was issued each day by the Labour Party organ, the "Daily Herald."

There are 5,000,000 workers in the Labour Party and Trade Union Congress organisations; yet the Labour leaders take no step to obey their own slogan.

Labour has sent out to Turkey every man, every gun, every ship the Government has called for.

Labour has actually sent out upwards of 60,000 men, with the necessary ships and munitions, and a large number of aeroplanes to fight in this Capitalist war.

Dockers Ask for Instructions.

When the dockers in the Port of London informed their officials that munitions were coming into the Port, and asked for instructions not to handle the munitions, the local officials passed on the request to the Union headquarters; but no reply was forthcoming.

London Dockers Refuse to Load Troopship.

The London dockers acted at last without instructions; they refused to load a troopship. It was transferred to Portsmouth. Unfortunately, the rank and file men in the London Docks were not in touch with the rank and file in Portsmouth, in which case they would have notified their comrades to look out for the ship and refuse to load it. The London men do not know what happened to the ship at Portsmouth.

Unfortunately, London's refusal to load the troopship is apparently an isolated case. From other ports the ships, the men, and the guns have been pouring forth apace.

Why Has the Labour Party Failed to Keep Its Word?

Why has the Labour Party failed to keep its word not to give the Government a single man, gun, or ship, to fight this war?

Trade Unions Obsolete.

Partly because the Trade Unions are obsolete as fighting organisations. Split into innumerable, not too sympathetic organisations, with boundary lines which have long since lost their meaning, with a membership which is apathetic, because it is given no real share in the policy of the Unions, the Trade Unions to-day are structurally unfitted to deal efficiently with a great war resistance movement which means a definite trial of strength with the Government and the great Capitalists.

The best machinery for such a struggle, the most speedily built up, the most difficult for the Government to attack, is the machinery of the Workshop Councils. When the minds of the workers are prepared for a great struggle against the Government, they will erect such machinery in spite of all the so-called wiseacres who may urge them to work through the obsolete Trade Unions.

Labour Leaders' Imperialist Policy.

The great reason why the Labour leaders have not acted is, however, that their policy

does not differ very much from that of the Lloyd George Government and the Capitalists in whose interests it acts.

Mr. Clynes, speaking at Bridport on September 25th, said "the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the Government differed chiefly as to the methods to be employed."

That is a correct rendering of the situation. Both the Labour Party and the Government desire to prevent either the Turks or the countries bordering on the Straits to control the Straits without interference from this country. Both the Labour Party and the Government desire to create so-called neutral zones about the Straits.

The Labour Party and the Government both say that the League of Nations should control the Straits and the neutral zones, but the League of Nations does not function, and the British Government has ordered British troops to the neutral zones, and British battleships to the Straits. The Labour leaders protest, but they allow the troops and the battleships to go.

Both the Labour leaders and the Government believe that the British Empire will be dominant in the League of Nations.

British politicians often boast that British foreign policy is continuous, whatever Government may be in power, and in the main that has always been so. It is the policy of all Capitalist Imperialism to grab all that is possible, and strive to reach as near to world domination as circumstances permit.

Labour Party War Aims.

During the War the Labour Party war aims were in all essentials the same as those of the Government.

The Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference held in Central Hall, Westminster, in 1918, was dominated by the British Labour Party. The Labour Party printed the resolutions of the Conference and circulated them in pamphlet form as its own war aims.

The question of Turkey was dealt with as follows:

The Conference condemns the handing back to the systematically violent domination of the Turkish Government any subject people. Thus, whatever may be proposed with regard to Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia, they cannot be restored to the tyranny of the Sultan and his Pashas. The Conference condemns the Imperialist aims of Governments and capitalists who would make of these and other territories now dominated by the Turkish hordes merely instruments either of exploitation or militarism. If the peoples of these territories do not feel themselves able to settle their own destinies, the Conference insists that, conformably with the policy of "no annexations," they should be placed for administration in the hands of the League of Nations.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

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

The high cost of production of the paper necessitates prompt payment.

"WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" NOW A PENNY.

The "Workers' Dreadnought" is now only a penny weekly. Its great propaganda work can therefore be widely extended by your help.

The "Dreadnought" circulation is rising: help it to boom!

If you take one copy, buy a second copy at least, to give away, or to sell.

If you sell the "Dreadnought," double your order: you will find the "Dreadnought" sells much more readily at a penny.

Send for our posters—we supply them free.

You may obtain a quire of "Dreadnoughts" (26 copies) for 1/6, to sell or to give away. We pay the postage, and credit you with the unsold copies, if returned to us within six weeks.

Now, then, send along that one and sixpence—you could not spend it better.

FRANK PENMAN IN LONDON.

It was such a glorious day, and the green of Hyde Park in the sunshine so enticing; it drew even some of the hardened London dwellers by its spell. After the meeting they were reluctant to leave it; they turned to the trees and lingered; then wandered off, to take tea there in the open, instead of repairing, as was their custom, to the crowded Lyons teashop across the road.

Frank Penman and Miss Mayence went naturally in the same direction; the Park was to them a frequent refuge from the City's grey and noise.

The tables were almost full; and, taking the first vacant seats, they found themselves facing Mr. and Mrs. Boffin and Mrs. Mercer, who had been to the meeting, and whom they slightly knew.

Mrs. Mercer greeted them hastily, then plunged again into an engrossing story she was telling Mrs. Boffin:

"She died on Saturday: poor girl, I was sorry. Perhaps it is the best thing that could happen; but then, of course, there is the child. I shall try to get the grandmother to take it."

"Doesn't she want it?" Mrs. Boffin asked.

"No; she wouldn't see it; she wouldn't see her either: didn't even go to the funeral."

"Won't the father look after it?"

"Oh, yes; he doesn't want the grandmother to have it: he's only afraid she might take the baby from him. Could she, if she wanted to, do you know?"

"I don't know; I should think she might, if she claimed it at once, but I shouldn't think she could if he had it for a time and looked after it properly. Do you know what the law is, Tom?"

Mrs. Boffin laid her hand on Boffin's arm to attract his attention.

Boffin had been ruminating, not listening to the chatter of his wife and her friend. He started:

"What's that?"

"Mrs. Mercer was telling me about Laura Dukes: it seems she's dead, and the question is whether her mother has a legal right to claim her baby. It appears the father wants it. What's the law about it?"

"Sure I don't know. Wasn't she living with a chap named Crayford, who had a wife in a lunatic asylum, or something like that? I don't blame them. I should think he must have treated her all right, if he wants to stick to the kid. I don't think much of her old mother—one of the acidulated sort, by the look of her."

"She was always too strict with the girl: that was the fault," Mrs. Mercer said tearfully, mopping her eyes. "Poor kid; I wish I'd known about it, it might have been different. She didn't even see Laura. They sent her a telegram when she was dying, but she didn't come till the next morning, when it was all over. Then she wanted Laura's rings and her insurance policy. The people at the hospital wouldn't give anything up to her; they said she'd have to go to him for anything like that. Mrs. Dukes was round at his mother's in Hoxton like a shot; but she wouldn't give her anything; said she'd have to wait till Bob Crayford was at home himself. He sent her the things as soon as he heard; said he didn't want to keep anything belonging to her people."

"They were very down on Mrs. Dukes at the hospital; but they spoke well of him. The nurse said he thought the world of Laura. She never saw two people more loving, she said. Poor Laura; she died with her head on his arm; poor kid!"

Mrs. Mercer wept a little.

"What did she die of?" asked Mrs. Boffin.

"Blood-poisoning, they said. It was worry that caused it."

"What did she worry about?" asked Boffin. "I thought you said they were so fond of each other."

"I should think anyone would have worried, placed as she was," said Mrs. Mercer reproachfully; "and beside that, they couldn't get a house; couldn't get even

a room. They had to stay at his mother's, and she didn't approve of it—seeing they weren't married. You can imagine what it was like for Laura, especially after she was expecting. Poor girl; she's better out of it! If only I could get Mrs. Dukes to take the child."

"Why should you want to put the child in the clutches of that disagreeable old woman?" asked Boffin. "She made her daughter as miserable as a girl could be; anyone could see that, and, as you said yourself, she wouldn't even go to see the girl when she was dying, and only troubled about the things she left behind her that money could be made out of."

"Sometimes they think more of the grandchildren than they did of their own," Mrs. Boffin said soothingly.

"Why should anyone want to take the child away from its father?" Boffin replied impatiently. "There's nothing against him that I can see. He seems to have acted decently all through."

"Getting a girl to live with you, when you've already got a wife, isn't usually thought decent, you know, Tom," Mrs. Boffin corrected.

"Not fair to say that, Mrs. Boffin, when the wife's in an asylum and the girl knows all about her," Dick Barbour ejaculated.

"Well, I meant what people usually think, you know; I didn't say it was just," said Mrs. Boffin, looking at the faces round the table to see what each was thinking. "Beside," she added, "think what it was in the movement: people wouldn't speak to them. Crayford had been so active; he was a good worker, and Mr. Dukes had been a member years ago, though he didn't come round much lately; still, people knew them, though I don't think Mrs. Dukes ever took much interest in anything outside her home—not in the movement, I mean."

"Well, of course, it made a talk," said Miss Pierce; "but the women's section of the Labour Party is asking the Government to bring in a Bill to make insanity or habitual drunkenness a ground for divorce, so as people could marry again: then we shouldn't have any such sad events."

"That would be better," agreed Mrs. Boffin; "but I should think it would be many years before it came in. How long did it take for women to get the vote; do you remember, Tom?"

"Oh, about sixty years or so, I think," said Boffin, lighting his pipe and closing his eyes to meditate.

"Strange," observed Bistre, "that you English Socialists are so devoted to the marriage laws that you permit them to wreck your lives. In other countries the case you describe would not have happened."

Miss Pierce protested: "I don't think it would have happened in the movement here if people had known all about it. I mean if people had known the wife was in an asylum. I don't think they would have ostracised Laura—not to that extent, anyway, not the broad-minded people. Don't you agree with me?" she turned to Miss Mayence.

"Some of them would not, I'm sure," said Miss Mayence; "but suppose the wife had not been in an asylum—suppose he and she just couldn't get on—a case of sheer incompatibility—and had agreed to part: what do you think the broad-minded people would have done then?"

"That would have been another thing," Miss Pierce replied with decision. "Of course that sort of thing is different. One can't afford to encourage it in the movement, or our opponents would say we were in favour of free love."

"It's considered quite the thing in America," said Dick Barbour. "Lady Astor got hers for incompatibility—it came out in 'John Bull'."

"She said she had other causes, but it wasn't necessary to prove them, seeing she could get it without," Mrs. Boffin added.

"As I observed," said Bistre with amiable pugnacity, "you English Socialists are devoted to the marriage laws. You are also the slaves of bourgeois opinion: you dare not flout it, lest you be criticised by your opponents."

"We don't mind their criticism," Miss Pierce answered, "so long as it is just; but, for the sake of our Cause, we ought to strive to live so as to be above reproach."

Bistre smiled: "You mean you do not object to the criticism of opponents, so long as it is unjust; but you dread having to meet criticism directed towards something that you—I don't mean you personally, of course—have actually done."

Miss Pierce was impatient: "I mean we shouldn't do things that we know will lay us open to criticism."

Dick Barbour laughed: "That's exactly what Bistre said; he said we don't do things, not because they're wrong, but because outsiders will criticise us for doing them. Bistre is quite right; he might just as well have said it about a dozen things quite unconnected with sex or marriage—why half the Socialists are trying to explain away Socialism itself because the capitalists abuse it. Take that article of Ponsonby's, in the 'Daily Herald' the other day, for instance, explaining that Labour isn't out for Communism. Of course I know Ponsonby isn't a Socialist—I never thought he was; but all sorts of mixtures call themselves Socialists in these days. To come to the point, Bistre is right: what the average Socialist politician likes is to be accused of something he hasn't done: then he can easily show up his opponent as a liar, without running the risk of having to defend anything that may be unpopular."

Miss Pierce was annoyed: "You're all arguing about nothing," she protested. "Of course we shouldn't have any defence—if, if we were guilty of a thing; but I object to the accusation that Socialism would destroy the marriage laws and inaugurate the reign of free love; you know as well as I do that it is false!"

Bistre shook his head: "I can't say that."

"What do you mean?" asked Miss Pierce.

"I mean that when we enter upon the classless order in which there shall be no money, or buying and selling, when the wage system has disappeared, and each and all may take as they please from the common store, the mercenary view that soils the union of men and women to-day will belong to the dead and hateful past."

"In Russia, in the Czar's time," said Blumenfeld, "the revolutionaries considered marriage primarily as a means for a woman to change her citizenship. If a Russian woman wanted to live in Germany, say, or to get away from Russia, she just married whoever was handy of the right nationality, and probably never saw him again. She stuck to the man she wanted, just the same, without ever bothering to marry him."

"In Finland," said a pale-faced youth with deep and tired eyes, who had been silently watching the others: "Socialists defy all such Capitalist laws. We neither marry according to law, nor register the birth of our children. We don't allow a Capitalist Government to regulate such matters for us."

REDUCING THE RATES.

The Labour Councils Lead the Way.

Hackney Borough Council has a Labour majority: its rates amount only to 5/2, and are the lowest in the Metropolitan area. Islington, where there is also a Labour majority, comes next, with a rate of 5/2.

If this is all that Labour politics amount to, the Capitalists will be only too pleased to "let Labour govern" an economical administration, which gives but small relief to the poor and unemployed, nor pays low wages to municipal workpeople, is just what the Capitalists desire.

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.

WAGE SLAVES—PAST AND PRESENT.

By Tom Anderson.

Go where you will, you see the once bright-eyed wage slave, sad and dejected. During the War he was a king, because those who were not away were working. Everybody was working. Everybody seemed happy—even the "Tommies" coming home were happy. They could get drunk, and have a good time; and all the folks were happy because they had the wherewithal to live.

The women-folk were all working as well, and making good wages; and the women-folk dressed themselves as they were never dressed before—fancy shoes and stockings, the latest in jumpers and hats, open-neck silk blouses, with little articles of jewellery. They were ladies then, and they looked it. It was a sight for the gods to see them at nights and on Sundays. They went to the music-halls—not to the gallery, no, no—to the best seat in the house. Many of them drank wine and smoked, just as ladies do. They told stories of the workshop. There was no boss, in one sense, for he never spoke a cross word to them. They were ladies; and who would think of cursing a lady?

It was a great time. We were at war, and we were living in luxury. Where did all the wealth come from? Nobody knew. All we knew was that we were going to kill the "bloody German swine"; and after that, oh! what a time we would have! We would make Germany pay. We would not require to work for months and months, because Germany would keep us. It was grand to think that poverty would be abolished from our land.

Well, well, we lived during the War. The thought of the many happy days we had; of the splendid feeds and drinks, and dances and music-halls, and trips; of our dresses, and our pay-time, is a memory that will never leave us.

Who said we were wage slaves? Whoever they are, they are liars—liars against God and man. Send them to the "front," and let them be shot. We are not wage slaves; we are free-born Britishers. Send round the drink. Fry the steak, Mary. Yes, we will have a piano, why should we not? And then they would talk of how their fathers and mothers lived before them. They would say they had to bring up a family on £1 a week. How did they do it? They did not know. The workers at that time were very, very poor. They had no w.c.s in the house or on the stair-head. They had no Labour Party, no music-halls or picture palaces or theatres. They were dumb animals—just beasts of burden, from early morn till late at night. But "thank God," you would hear them remark, "that day is past; we are free men and women now!"

Slowly but surely the scene has changed. They have a free holiday on Armistice Day, and they shout and sing, and drink, and carry the Union Jack, and the police allow them a little extra liberty, and they are overjoyed because they have won and the good time is still on, and the boss is a fine fellow, and the King is all right—everything is right.

The "Tommies" come home. They, too, are jubilant, and flush of cash. What though a million had died—it had to be. And they drink and dress, and carry on just as the others. They have a "good time."

The scene is changed. They are standing at the Bureau in their thousands to get the "dough." The police line them up into a queue, and they stand for hours and hours. It rains; that's nothing, they are enured to hardship. Look down the long line. The sons of Britain waiting for doles; the men who pushed the bayonets through the Hun. The regimental officials of the Bureau treat them as scum.

Weeks pass, months pass, years pass. Sad is the sight. "Down and out" is written on every face. Despair now is the keynote. Hope has left the slum, and in its place has

come nothing, not even curses. They cannot swear, they cannot think, they cannot speak. They can do nothing but shun along. Look at their women and children; many are bare-footed. There are no boots in the land, because we won the War. Look into their homes, one and two apartments, bare! The Rope and King Billy is even away. They have been taken to a resting-place for bread. The women; look at the women, and if you are human, go and curse the human race. Go and curse the God that allows them to live. Go and curse your Parliaments and politicians, and also your Labour Party. Go and curse your Trade Union movement and its Congress. Go and curse your Church, and if you have a wish worthy of man, say: "To hell with the lot of them; they are parasites sitting on the back of the dumb animals they call men and women in Britain." Never in the history of the wage slaves have they been so low mentally, morally, physically, and materially as they are to-day. After fifty years of Trade Union organisation the position seems absolutely hopeless. In the Clyde ship-building area, where every man holds a Union card, they could do nothing but retreat. Half a million miners were starved into submission by a dozen men; and at least two million workers are "down and out," for all time, and shall be dubbed social scum.

Your Utopian Socialist movement could not give the proletariat sufficient status to make him fight. They wanted to do it by soft words, by moral persuasion; as if anyone would listen to the moral vapourings of the slaves. Morals don't belong to you, they are manufactured by the class above you, and you must accept—and you do accept—them.

If the proletariat had "guts"—the same kind of "guts" that got him to go over the "top"—then something would happen. Something would be bound to happen, because twelve men would never be allowed to starve half a million. Until the proletariat learns that, he must meet force by force; until then there is no hope.

Again, why should he not bake his own bread? Why not make his own clothes or boots? Why not control all the wants of his social life? Until he learns this class-conscious lesson, his case is hopeless. And why does he read his master's Press, and so poison his mind, and also that of his family? He does so because he is a slave. He has been born a slave, educated and trained as a slave, and as a slave he is unable to break the chains that bind him to his master; and his master laughs, and his master's Church pumps the opium into him from birth to death, and his manumitted leaders say: "One step at a time." And so, fellow-worker, there is no hope except by joining with your fellows to establish the class-less State, and that means Communism. You may make your choice—live and die in poverty and squalor as a wage slave, or come out and fight and die as a man fighting for all that is noble in life. Towards that goal every thinking worker calls you.

POSTER PARADING.

West End.

(Well-dressed people strutting by with haughty stare.)

Middle-aged woman selling matches in the gutter (to woman carrying a banner against the war quietly and sadly): "They won't get any of my sons for this war. They were all three killed in the last."

One-armed Sandwichman in the Haymarket: "Are the Turks to be allowed to ruin our Empire? I've been in the Army twenty years."

Poster Parader: "And now you are in the gutter."

Sandwichman: "You're an agitator."

Young Man of bourgeois exterior: "When you live in Rome, you must do as Rome does."

Poster Parader: "What, acquiesce in another Capitalist war?"

Young Man: "We have to live in this world."

Poster Parader: "We have to change it!"

Young Man: "I sympathise with you: I had two years of it last time, but nothing can be done: you have to go with the stream."

If everyone had said that we might still be stained with wood!

Taxi Driver (outside fashionable hotel): "Go home and mind your own business; don't interfere with the Government."

Porter: "It's everybody's business: I reckon we're fools to stand it. We had enough in the last war. It's a disgrace!"

East End.

General chorus of women:

"War! I should think we don't want any more of it, indeed! I've lost some in the last, and I don't want to lose any more! When you've suffered, you understand."

Two men running after poster paraders: "Will you take some of them bills to the picture palace? The man there wants to give them out to the people."

Unemployed Man: "You people have got some guts! Glad you've come down here. Give me some of them bills to give out."

Docker: "We wouldn't load the troopship, and they took it off to Portsmouth. We don't want any more Capitalist wars!"

General chorus: "Will you give me some bills, please?"

CORRESPONDENCE.

DEAR EDITOR.—I was much interested in S. Hugh Simcoe's letter, which tempts me to quote from the passage in "Rural Rides" which William Cobbett addressed to Farmer Biel of Beaulieu, in the New Forest. It runs as follows:

"Now, Farmer John Biel, I dare say that you are a very good Protestant; and I am a monstrous good Protestant too. We cannot bear the Pope, nor their priests that makes confess their sins and go down upon their marrow-bones before them. But, Master Biel, let us give the devil his due, and let us not act worse by those Roman Catholics (who, by-the-by, were our forefathers) than we are willing to act by the devil himself."

"Now then, here were a set of monks, and also a set of Knights' Templars. Neither of them could marry; of course, neither of them could have wives and families. They could possess no private property; they could bequeath nothing; they could own nothing; but that which they owned in common with the rest of their body. They could hoard no money; they could save nothing. Whatever they received as rent for their lands, they must necessarily spend upon the spot, for they never could quit that spot. They did spend it all upon the spot; they kept all the poor. Beuley, and all round Beuley, saw no misery, and had never heard the damned name of pauper pronounced, as long as those monks and Templars continued."

"You and I are excellent Protestants, Farmer John Biel; you and I have often assisted on November 5th to burn Guy Fawkes, the Pope, and the Devil. But you and I, Farmer John Biel, would much rather be life holders under monks and Templars than rack-renters under duchesses. The monks and the knights were the lords of their manors; but the farmers under them were not rack-renters; the farmers under them held by lease of lives, continued in the same farms from father to son for hundreds of years; they were real yeomen, and not miserable rack-renters, such as now till the land of this once happy country, and who are little better than the drivers of the labourers, for the profit of the landlords."

"Farmer John Biel, what the Duchess of Buccleugh does you know, and I do not. She may, for anything I know to the contrary, lease her farms on lease of lives, with rent so very moderate and easy, as for the farm to be half as good as the farmer's own, at any rate. The Duchess may, for anything that I know to the contrary, feed all the hungry, clothe all the naked, comfort all the sick, and prevent the hated name of pauper from being pronounced in the district of Beuley. Her Grace may, for anything that I know to the contrary, make poor-rates to be wholly unnecessary and unknown in your country; she may receive, lodge, and feed the stranger; she may, in short, employ the rents of this fine estate of Beuley to make the whole district happy; she may not carry a farthing of the rents away from the spot; and she may consume, by herself, and her own family servants, only just as much as is necessary to the preservation of their life and health."

"Her Grace may do all this; I do not say or insinuate that she does not do it all; but, Protestant here, or Protestant there, Farmer John Biel, this I do say, that unless her Grace do all this, the monks and the Templars were better for Beuley than her Grace."

Yours sincerely,

ERNEST BAIRSTOW.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOUNDED 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

Ad Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor
 or Business Communications to the Manager:
 Workers' Dreadnought, 162, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4
 (TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 7240.)

SUBSCRIPTION:
 THREE MONTHS (13 weeks) ... Post Free 1/7½
 SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ... " " 3/3
 ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ... " " 6/6

Vol. IX. No. 30. Saturday, October 7, 1922.

TAKE COURAGE!

To George Lansbury, and Others.

In the "Daily Herald" of September 31st, George Lansbury wrote that a friend in Bow had asked him:

"What I would do were I a young man with a wife and children, to whom, after a long period of unemployment, of semi-starvation through unemployment, work at good wages were suddenly offered in connection with a war. My answer was quite a halting one, for so true is it, none of us know what we would do when in such a difficult position. I replied I hope I would follow truth wherever it might lead me. This, however, was no real answer; and my object in writing about this subject is to ask my readers to fix their minds on realities."

Do you forget, George Lansbury, that men who had been unemployed for many months refused to blackleg their fellows in the recent miners' lock-out, and the engineers' lock-out? Do you forget that in every strike and lock-out that ever has occurred, unemployed men and women, rather than take sides with the employer, against their fellow-workers, have achieved that act of heroism of which you doubt your own capability, even in face of a great war.

Do you not know that unemployed men to-day have pledged themselves not to engage in war work?

Do you forget the absolutist conscientious objectors, George Lansbury? They were young men with wives and little families who went to gaol, leaving their dependants to penury, rather than assist the Great War, even so far as to take alternative service in work only remotely connected with war which would release another man for the front?

If your courage is not equal to the courage which the conscientious objectors displayed under exceptionally difficult circumstances in the last war; if you have not the courage which the average Trade Unionist displays in innumerable strikes and lock-outs as a matter of ordinary solidarity, do you think you are justified in occupying the position of a leader and an example to the workers, George Lansbury? The whole tone of your article is one of helpless pessimism and lack of faith. You say:

"What, then, can be done? First, do not let any of us vote for a general strike unless we mean it; do not rashly pledge yourself before counting the cost."

Your whole article is deterrent from action. It is the voice of the tempter, cowardice, who says: Do not run any personal risks: count the cost of your personal suffering: it is easier to do as you are told and follow the line of least resistance. Your whole argument is an excuse for those who have not the courage to act up to their convictions. It is a pity, George Lansbury, that a man of your age should thus reinforce the weaker side of younger and less experienced people.

You go on to say:

"Although we may be in a minority, we must, by voice and pen, proclaim our faith that human life is too sacred, too valuable, to be used as cannon fodder in the service of wicked men."

Words, empty words, George Lansbury; this is no time for empty words, whose authors intend and desire no action. Lives are at stake: platitudes will not save them. All the ink of Fleet Street will not stem the flow of blood that the war will cause.

Apparently in your vacillating way, you half-regret that the workers have not struck against the sending forth of soldiers, warships, and munitions, for you say:

"During the past few days many of us have felt heart-sick when realising the futility of the slogan: 'Not a man, not a gun, not a ship!' Apparently we may just as well save our breath and ink for all the effective good that has come from our resolutions. Guns, ammunition, aeroplanes by the thousands of tons daily leave the ports, and tens of thousands of troops follow to kill and destroy whenever the order is given them to do so. I am not going to apportion blame for this, because I believe we are all to blame."

You are to blame, George Lansbury, because you did not issue an appeal to the workers in the docks and on the railways to stop the men and the guns going forth. You are to blame because you do not denounce the Trade Union officials for not giving their members the instruction not to handle war material or to assist the war in any way.

HAVELOCK WILSON'S P.C. 5.

Thousands of seamen are deprived of employment by the iniquitous system devised by Havelock Wilson and the shipowners to force men to join Havelock Wilson's corrupt National Union of Seamen and Firemen. A form called the P.C. 5 has been issued by the Shipping Federation, and ship masters are instructed only to engage men who present this form, stamped both by Havelock Wilson's Union and by the Shipping Federation. The Federation will not stamp it till the Union has done so.

Members of Havelock Wilson's Union must pay £2 to join and 1/- a week thereafter. The Union will only stamp the P.C. 5 for men who are fully paid up members of Wilson's Union.

Men who have belonged to the Union for 20 and 30 years, and have been unemployed for several months, are in some cases unable to pay up the arrears, but they must do so or pay £2 to join the Union again: otherwise they cannot get work.

Men who have left Havelock Wilson's Union in disgust and joined Cotter's New Marine Workers' Union cannot get work unless they also re-join Wilson's Union. Thousands of men belong to both Unions in order to have a better chance of getting employment.

Meanwhile, Cotter's Union has black-listed and refused to admit some of the men in every port who were most active in paving the way for a break with Havelock Wilson's Union. These boycotted men are the genuine rebels: the men who are out for a Communist Industrial Republic and are endeavouring to build up a rank and file Workers' Council Movement.

Workers on the ships, form your Ship Councils and prevent the boycott of your mates!

THE COMMUNIST OBJECTIVE.

The Communist Movement is essentially a rank-and-file movement. It has no place for leaders as commonly understood. It makes no appeal to the passions of the mob, their ignorance, and prejudice. It does not desire to put individuals or parties into power. It has no place for personalities in debate; it seeks not to score intellectually.

In that it hopes to obtain the tacit or emotional support of the crowd; every party may call itself a rank-and-file party. For the same reason, any politician may call himself a democrat or profess to believe in democracy.

The Communist Movement shoulders a harder task: that of striving for an intelligence and intellectual freedom on the part of the

people that no party so strenuously demands. Communism can only be built up by conscious effort of a high order. It has no place for mob servility, for thoughtless action, un-directed or purposeless effort.

Individual conversion, that greatest and most difficult object of propaganda, is the Communist aim. That is the direction in which the convinced Communist applies himself assiduously. While meetings play their part, it is the personal contact, the dissemination of facts, in the form of the printed word, and, better still, the carrying out of principles, that form the most formidable part of Communist activities.

Communists can afford to eschew rhetoric and phrases; indeed, they must. The effective armoury consists of facts as applied to the present system, an elaboration of an alternative system based on the facts of just principles, and a classless order of society.

Nevertheless, Communism is no cold-blooded theory: it is a warm, life-giving and comradeship compelling gospel. It needs a greater measure of love and selflessness than the present system demands for its continuance. It will only be built by sacrifice. When the worker has seen the vision of the classless community, wages and hours cease to be an "end-all"; no minimised ruthlessness of Capitalism will ever satisfy. He will continue to play his part in the guerilla warfare of the classes; he will accept without murmur everything that comes to him as a soldier in an army that can never accept defeat; his ideal will be an unfailing beacon light.

Having renounced the lives of the Capitalist world, desiring in his alternative order of society nothing which others cannot have on equal terms, the Communist, by disarming himself of all claims to social privilege and Capitalist economic power, arms himself with the unquenchable, unconquerable fire of a moral purpose that defies corruption.

The guarantee of permanence of the ideal of Communism—which is brotherhood in practical contradistinction to the brotherhood preached under, and in conjunction with, Capitalism—is to be found in Communist principles. Communist principles are in accordance with the ascertained facts of natural law and of love.

ERNEST BAIRSTOW.

SOME POPULATION FIGURES.

Thrace.		
Turks.		Greeks.
1,154,802		308,212
Western Asia Minor.		
Turks.	Greeks	Armenians.
7,447,035	882,608	497,439
Eastern Asia Minor.		
2,660,194	90,093	665,665

"The British Cabinet has apparently decided to include Constantinople and the adjacent territory within the far-flung Commonwealth of Free Nations, though for publication the British statesmen are talking of the 'internationalisation' of this zone and the Straits."—"The Freeman," New York.

COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

WORKS FOR COMMUNISM.—A classless order of society in which there shall be no rich and poor, no masters or servants, no landlords and capitalists, no buying and selling, no money, no wages. Each shall use according to need and desires of the earth's fruits and the product of the common labour. Each shall give to the service of the community according to capacity. Production and distribution shall be organised by those who do the work through the Soviets.

TACTICS.—No compromise with non-Communists and Reformers. No affiliation with the Labour Party. Continuous teaching of Communism. Continuous struggle for Communism.

Preparation for the Soviets: that is to say, organisation of the workers to take over and administer the industries of the creation of One Big Revolutionary Union with industrial departments built up from the workshop basis on the Soviet model. Continuous teaching of the futility of Parliamentary action,

OIL AND THE WAR CLOUDS.

II.

Baku is important, not only because it is the centre of rich oilfields, but because it is the base for the refining and distribution of the oil, not only of the Caucasus, but of North Persia, Turkestan, and Siberia.

Batoum.

Batoum is important because it is the port from which Caucasian, Siberian, Turkestan, and Persian oil is shipped westward. There is an oil pipe-line from Baku to Batoum. This pipe is 560 miles long. It has a diameter of 8 inches. It requires nineteen pumping-stations, and has a capacity of a million tons a year.

Batoum before the War was in Russia. It now belongs to the State of Georgia, where there was a clamour for self-determination which was conceded by Soviet Russia. Georgia presently became a Soviet Republic federated with Soviet Russia. The interest taken in little Georgia by some of our Imperialists is explained by the fact that Batoum is in Georgia. Whoever controls Georgia controls the export of oil from Batoum. Georgia as a little independent State could easily be coerced by a stronger power—say the British. Georgia federated with Soviet Russia would be under Moscow's influence.

The Turks are now laying claim to Georgia, and the Turks are receiving French support.

Persian Oil.

Both northern and southern Persia are rich in oil. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company—an all-British company, in which the British Government holds the majority of the shares—monopolises the south Persian oilfields.

The Anglo-Persian Oil Company was formed in 1909 to take over the concession held by the Burmah Oil Company and the late Lord Strathcona. This concession had been obtained from the Persian Government by a Mr. Darcy. The Burmah Oil Company was already exploiting oil in Burmah, and was subsidised by the British Government. The Government secured the controlling interest in the new Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

The Anglo-Persian Oil Company also exploits oil in North Persia, and is in competition there with the American Standard Oil Company. The Persian Government recently granted the Standard Oil a concession on territory which the Anglo-Persian claimed as its own. The dispute is ostensibly patched up, but the Americans are not satisfied.

American Oil.

The United States was the first country to make an extensive use of fuel oil. To-day two-thirds of the world's oil production comes from the United States; but whilst the oil is being drawn from United States soil at the rate of 450,000,000 barrels a year, the reserves of oil existing in the United States are believed to be only about 7,000,000,000 barrels. Thus at America's present rate of consumption her native oil supplies are said to be only enough to last about twenty years.

This estimate of affairs should be taken with some reserve. America is a vast Continent, and further oil reserves are likely to be discovered there. We suspect that American Capitalism is advertising and exploiting the situation in order to stimulate popular interest in oil and to secure Government assistance in securing foreign oil resources for American Capitalism to exploit, and thereby increase their wealth. We suspect that British oil experts have also been not unwilling to promote the view that there is a limited supply of oil in the world, and that the nation which does not secure its supplies early will presently find itself at the mercy of its neighbours whose oil-driven navies will easily outmatch its own ships.

Be this as it may, British Capitalism, and the British Government itself, have vigorously assisted in using up the supplies of

United States oil, and the enterprise has, incidentally, been highly profitable to the Capitalists.

British Government's Oil Plot.

The business of securing United States oil for British companies was very stealthily conducted.

A small British mother-of-pearl company, called the Shell Transport, traded in distant seas. Aided by Sir Marcus Samuel and by capital from the Rothschilds, the Shell Transport took up oil, and soon secured concessions in Rumania, Russia, the Dutch East Indies, and Egypt.

In 1911 the Mexican Eagle Company was formed by the Pearson group, with Lord Cowdray at their head, to develop the oils of Mexico. The company acquired an interest in the rich Tampico oilfields on the Gulf of Mexico, a most important centre, since, through the construction of the Panama Canal half the world's liners would soon be passing through the Caribbean Sea. American Capitalists objected to this concession, for they regard Mexico as their special sphere of expansion. Rival claimants to rulership in Mexico who have struggled over that little republic during recent years have been subsidised by the rival oil interests—the British and the American—and the struggle still continues.

In 1912-13 the Mexican Eagle secured important concessions from the Governments of Costa Rica, Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador. These concessions would have been still more important in regard to supplying oil to the ships passing through the Panama Canal. Again the United States protested, declaring that the concessions were an infringement of the Monroe Doctrine. The Governments of the little States which had granted the concessions withdrew them in fear of the power of the United States.

The British Shell Transport now entered the field. It first obtained concessions in the British Colony of Trinidad, then in Venezuela and Colombia. This time the United States did not protest. It was not yet realised in America that the Shell Transport Company, also, was working in conjunction with the British Government. The Shell Transport veiled its activities by creating a number of subsidiary companies. One of these is the Burlington Investment Company, a subsidiary company of which is the Colon Development Company, a British concern, but formed in conjunction with the American Carib Syndicate.

The Shell Transport did not stop at obtaining concessions in the small States of Central America. It carried its operations into the United States themselves. The United States Government, unlike the British, had preserved the "open door" in regard to oil within its borders. The Shell Transport, or anyone else, American or foreign, could buy land in the States, and if there were oil, or ore deposits below the surface, it could own that wealth with the land it bought.

American public opinion was chiefly concerned at this time with the spread of the great Trusts. Competitors with the Standard Oil Trust were therefore sure of a welcome in many quarters.

The Shell Transport and the Royal Dutch Oil Company, with which the Shell combined in 1907, soon secured oil concessions in California, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The Royal Dutch-Shell Combine.

All this was being engineered by the Petroleum Committee, the appointment of which Lord Fisher had secured. The Royal Dutch Oil Company had had its original base of operations in the Dutch East Indies. From 1907 the Royal Dutch and the Shell Transport agreed to grant each other 40 per cent. of the shares in all their new subsidiary undertakings, and an understanding was reached between them on all questions of markets, prices, freights, etc.

When war broke out, the Royal Dutch, like its partner in the Combine, the Shell Transport, placed its resources at the disposal of the Allies, and received in return the protection of the British Government, and, incidentally, of its Navy. This understanding is said to have been further strengthened and cemented since the War. The Dutch Government, though at one time regarded as pro-German, has probably also come within the orbit of British influence, just as Belgium is in the orbit of French influence.

A Rude Awakening for U.S. Oil Kings.

During the War the United States supplied 80 per cent. of the fuel oil used by the Allies. The oil capitalists of America made vast sums of money, and were acclaimed for their services to what was called the cause of human liberty.

After the War the American oil kings, observing that their oilfields had passed the highest peak of their productive capacity, began prospecting abroad. In October, 1919, one of the prospectors of Standard Oil reached Jerusalem, only to be arrested by the British General in command of the city. President Wilson protested in the name of the Fourteen Points that there should be "equality of treatment," especially in such countries as Palestine actually "mandated" to the British by the League of Nations, for the protection and welfare of the poor natives, as it was pretended.

The British Foreign Office, with its tongue in its cheek replied that there was no discrimination against its noble Allies, the American capitalists, because, as a matter of fact, the Foreign Office had prohibited prospecting by anyone.

The same reply greeted the request of President Wilson for the "open door" to American oil prospectors in Mesopotamia. In Central America it was discovered that British banks had secured a controlling interest in certain oil companies that had been thought to be American, and in every direction America's quest for oil met the closed door.

Some British patriots, excessively ignorant, plume themselves on the thought that Britain is a Free Trade nation, and that therefore it is for the good of humanity that the British Empire should be so vast that the sun never sets on it. Here was an illustration of the fatuity of such fancies.

On March 10th, 1920, the United States Senate called for a report upon "the measures taken by foreign Governments to exclude Americans from oilfields."

British Oil King's Boast.

One of the British oil kings, Sir E. Mackay Edgar, replied to this challenge in the "Times," exulting over the manner in which the British Capitalist Government has stolen a march on the Americans:

"To the tune of many millions of pounds a year, America, before very long, will have to purchase from British companies and to pay for in dollar currency, in increasing proportions, the oil she cannot do without and is no longer able to furnish from her own store. I estimate that, if their present curve of consumption, especially of high-grade products, is maintained, Americans, in ten years, will be under the necessity of importing 500 million barrels of oil yearly at 2 dols. a barrel—a very low figure—and that means an annual payment of 1,000,000,000 per annum, most, if not all, of which will find its way into British pockets. . . . With the exception of Mexico and, to a lesser extent, of Central America, the outer world is securely barricaded against an American invasion in force. There may be small isolated allies, but there can never be a massed attack. The British position is impregnable."

On May 17th, 1920, the U.S. Senate received the report it had called for, which

stated that the British Empire restricted Americans from exploiting oil within its territories:

"1. By debarring foreigners and foreign nationals from owning or operating oil-producing properties in the British Isles, Colonies, and Protectorates.

"2. By direct participation in ownership and control of petroleum properties.

"3. By arrangements to prevent British oil companies from selling their properties to foreign-owned or controlled companies.

"4. By Orders in Council that prohibit the transfer of shares in British oil companies to other than British subjects or nationals.

"British monopolies have already been established in the United Kingdom, Persia, India, and many other countries. . . ."

U.S. Retallates.

The United States Government was now determined to retaliate.

On April 28th it procured from the Senate authorisation for the Naval Secretary to set apart "reserves" of petroliferous land in any State, such land not to be leased or sold without his consent.

United States resentment at having been out-manoeuvred in the oil scramble will simmer until it leads to war.

Whilst the British Government admittedly owns half the shares in the Burmah Oil Company and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, it denies, however, that it has either any financial interest or control in the much larger Royal Dutch-Shell Combine, although the Shell and the Anglo-Persian have an agreement by which the Shell markets the produce of the Anglo-Persian. The British Government even denies that it has any control over the commercial policy of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, in which it holds the majority of shares. Such protestations are treated with scorn in France and America, the two countries where the British oil seizure policy is most resented.

As a matter of fact, the Government's pretence that it does not interfere in oil policy is grossly absurd, because all Governments under Capitalism obey the dictates of the great Capitalists upon oil, as upon other important matters. The men who control the great oil companies are in close touch with the Government. Governments frequently pretend that they do not interfere in commercial matters, but the Foreign Office diplomats of all the Governments are at the disposal of their great national Capitalists, and when the diplomats fail to achieve the desired end, the armies and navies are brought into play for the same Capitalist interests.

The Germans in Mesopotamia.

Before the War the Germans discovered oil in the upper valley of the river Tigris, which waters Mesopotamia and flows south to the Persian Gulf. The Germans had obtained from the Turks a concession to build a railway to Bagdad (that Berlin to Bagdad railway over which there was so much friction!). By this railway it was intended that the Tigris oil would be transported.

The British objected to the Germans developing this oil. The quarrel was patched up for the time being by conceding the oilfields to a firm called the Turkish Petroleum Oil Company, the capital of which was to be provided in part by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, in part by the Royal Dutch, and in part by the Germans. The Germans, as a matter of fact, held only 25 per cent. of the shares, and after the War these were granted to the French by the San Remo agreement.

The jealousy to secure control of Mesopotamia and its oil, and this railway to the East, were part of the great rivalry that led to the War. The British, by the method of the mailed fist, secured control of this important trade route with Mesopotamia and its oil.

The San Remo Agreement.

In pursuance of the British Imperialists' deliberate policy of securing world domination through oil, they set themselves to gain control of the oil within the French

dominions. The San Remo agreement, though professedly a cementing of the friendly Entente, was a part of this policy.

The San Remo agreement, on behalf of the British and French Governments, was concluded in April 1920, between Sir John Cadman, the chairman of the British Petroleum Executive, and M. Philippe Berthelot, for the French Government. This agreement dealt with oil in Mesopotamia, Galicia, Rumania, Asia Minor, Russia, the French Colonies, and British Crown Colonies.

As to Mesopotamia, the French were to get only the 25 per cent. share held by the Germans in the Turkish Petroleum Company, 50 per cent. being held by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, and 25 per cent. by the Royal Dutch-Shell. The French Government was to be allowed to purchase 25 per cent. of the output at market rates, and the company was to remain under permanent British control. In return, the French Government is to arrange for the construction, when the company desires it, of two pipe-lines to the Mediterranean, through French spheres of influence, without charging any royalties or way-leaves for the oil transported, also to give facilities at the terminal points for erection of depots, railway refineries, loading wharfs, etc. The material necessary for the construction shall be free from import duties and way-leaves. The French Army of Occupation must guarantee the security of the concern.

In the French Colonies the San Remo agreement binds the French Government to give facilities to Franco-British companies for the acquisition of oil concessions, provided these groups contain at least 67 per cent. of French capital. The British agreed to give "similar advantages" in the British Crown Colonies, "so far as existing regulations allow." Existing regulations, however, debar other than British subjects from holding oil concessions in British territory, and also limit the amount of shares which may be held by foreigners. It is prescribed, for instance, in Trinidad, that not more than 25 per cent. of the capital and voting rights may be held by foreigners, and that the chairman, managing director, and a majority of the other directors, must be British. The bargain is thus most disadvantageous to the French. The French stipulation applies only to the capital invested in the concern. The result—the outcome of very skilful diplomacy and manipulation by the British petroleum magnates—is that the newly discovered oilfields in French possessions, in Algeria, Morocco, and Madagascar, have been handed over to the Royal Dutch-Shell group to exploit. British Capitalist Imperialism is not much concerned as to the nationality of the majority of the small shareholders, so long as it has arranged that the directors of the company and the large holdings which assure the majority at the shareholders' meetings, are under their control. The majority of the Royal Dutch shares is actually said to be in French hands, but the combine is securely under British control.

This agreement with the Royal Dutch applied, not only to the French Colonies, but to all countries where France might have oil interests. The San Remo agreement applied also to Rumania and to Russia, where the French and British Governments agreed to give joint support to their respective nationals. How this bargain regarding Russia was broken by British Government representatives at the Genoa Conference we have already seen.

Francis Delaisi, in his book on "Oil," declares that the agreement to hand over the exploitation of French oil to the Royal Dutch was rung from the French Government by a promise by Lord Curzon that the French should have Syria. Emir Feisal was then repelling the advance of the French into Syria, and Emir Feisal was supported by British arms and money. When these were withdrawn, on the oil bargain being cemented, the French General Gouraud made his triumphal entry into Damascus, which was acclaimed by the French and British newspapers.

The Greeks have been used by the British Government as a pawn against the Turks, just as Feisal was used against the French. In the latter case, also, the Government is influenced by its rivalry with France. The French interests in the Rumanian oilfields are at least equal to the British; but in Rumania, also, the Royal Dutch will be in control. Though Franco-British companies will be formed, their business will be only to find the capital.

The French shareholders will grow richer by the prosperity of British companies; but the power will be in British hands. The great ones of France bitterly resent the position.

U.S.A. Objects to San Remo Agreement.

British Capitalism had got the better of French in the San Remo agreement, but it was obvious that the Americans would keep them out of all territory under French control. The agreement was kept secret at first, but of course it presently became known, and of course U.S. Capitalism objected.

The Americans were already realising the discrimination which the Franco-British oil agreement was causing against them in many directions. For instance, during the War the British Government, by means of the Navy, sequestered the oil-boats of the German subsidiary company of the U.S. Standard Oil Company. As soon as the Armistice was concluded, the Standard Oil Company asked for these boats to be handed over to it, promising to put them at the disposal of French oil companies. The British Government resisted the demand, the French gave the Americans little support. A year passed in negotiations, during which Standard Oil was losing profits it might have made. Such are not trivial matters to the dividend hunter.

The Standard Oil Company, on April 1st, 1920, formed a Franco-American subsidiary company, which bought a magnificent building in Paris for several million pounds, and made important oil contracts. The San Remo agreement was signed on April 24th, and very shortly afterwards the French Government refused to recognise the contracts between this new subsidiary company of the U.S. Standard Oil and its French customers. The United States Ambassador protested. The French Government's Commissioner, M. Laurent Eynac, replied ambiguously. Then the text of the San Remo agreement became known; it was published, first unofficially, then officially, in "Le Temps."

The U.S. Government addressed a Note of protest to France and Britain, demanding the open door—or, in other words, no discrimination against oil concessionaires on account of their nationality. To punish the French, the United States refused to assist in floating the International loan, by which the French Government would realise at once the money which was supposed to be coming to it, in some far future, under the German indemnities.

Nevertheless, the San Remo agreement remained, but the United States is a powerful factor which cannot be altogether ignored. Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Secretary, and Sir John Cadman protested, and still protest, that Britain also believes in test, that Britain also believes in the open door. Such protestation, of course, failed to satisfy the Yankees, and it was necessary to allow Standard Oil to resume an oil concession in Palestine, which it had possessed before the War.

Americans Kept Out of Dutch Oilfields.

The U.S. Standard Oil Company now turned its attention to the rich oilfields of Djambi, in the Dutch East Indies, a matter of much greater immediate commercial importance than Palestine and Mesopotamia. The Royal Dutch-Shell Combine, already established in the Dutch East Indies, was determined to be the monopolist there.

On April 19th, 1921, the United States Minister at The Hague delivered a Note to the Dutch Government, protesting against all the

rights in the Djambi area being given to the Royal Dutch-Shell Combine, and expressing the U.S. Government's concern "that a monopoly of such far-reaching importance in the development of oil is about to be bestowed upon a company in which foreign capital, other than American, is so largely interested."

The protest was unavailing. British Government influence, and that of Dutch shareholders, was too strong. At the end of April, 1921, the Dutch States General passed the Bill awarding the working of the Djambi oil-fields to the Batavia Oil Company, a subsidiary company of the Royal Dutch.

The Dutch Government, now a weak subsidiary within the orbit of British Imperial power, dared not refuse the bargain.

The ordinary Dutchman knew nothing of the fact that this concession to the Batavia Oil Company would be one of the causes of the next war. Thus are the people powerless to control their destinies through the medium of Parliamentary Government in a Capitalist State.

Sir John Cadman's Patched-up Peace With U.S.A.

After the Dutch East Indies came the conflict between the U.S. Standard Oil Company and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, regarding the oil of Northern Persia. Sir John Cadman was in the United States at the time. Remember that it was he who signed the San Remo agreement for the British Government, that he is technical adviser to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, in which the British Admiralty owns half the shares, that he was director of His Majesty's Petroleum Executive, is certainly on whatever Oil Committee the Government is now running, and is also chairman of the Inter-Allied Petroleum Executive. Sir John Cadman endeavoured to patch up an oil peace with the Americans. Although the Government pretends it has no oil policy, Sir John Cadman made an agreement for the equal exploitation of North Persia by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the Standard Oil Company. The peace, however, is only a patched-up peace. The oil contest continues, and it is one of the great forces leading to another war.

Who Wants to Rule the World?

The guiding principle of Capitalism: the stuff of which it is made is competition, the strife to make profit out of one's fellows, and to grow richer than one's fellows. This strife, which is inherent in all the ramifications of society, finds its final expression in the contest of great Empires for world dominion. The British Empire, France, and the United States: these are the great competitors to-day, though the Eastern nations, at present only striving to free themselves from Western domination, may spring forth as candidates for world dominion presently.

The Allied Governments declared that the last war was the result of Germany's striving to rule the world. The rulers of the German Empire were as eager for world dominion as are the rulers of the British Empire; but the rulers of the British Empire were, and are, much nearer to becoming world rulers. The German Empire was only a candidate for world rulership which had made remarkable progress, considering that it was a late comer in the race.

The contest for world dominion has become keener since Germany was eliminated from the struggle. The fears of each one has intensified that, not itself, but another one of the rivals may become the dominant power, now that the three great competitors, enriched by the War and the spoils rung from Germany and her allies, have increased the vast difference in wealth and power between themselves and the rest of the world. The contest for world dominion, like the smaller contests of Capitalism, can never have a permanent solution. Ever new contests will, and must, arise so long as Capitalism remains. Capitalism is always at war; its component parts are always contending with each other.

The present crisis in the East may result in the British Empire annexing the Straits, as it annexed Egypt and other parts of the Empire. On the other hand, it may lead to a contest which will break up the British combination. This may prove to be just one more of "England's Little Wars" to extend the boundaries of the Empire; but the other great rivals are watching with jealous vigilance the moment when the British Empire shall be attacked, and, if its rivals can compass that, destroyed, and its wealth divided amongst the other combatants. If the British Empire seizes the Straits, it must either fight its powerful rivals to keep the Straits, or it must buy off the jealousy of its rivals by agreeing that they shall secure an equal acquisition of wealth and power, by another theft from Turkey, or some other nation which is unable to resist.

So the contest will continue, always growing fiercer, whilst Capitalism continues. Science places ever more terrible means of warfare at the disposal of the great combatants, the few rich men behind the Governments of the Great Powers, who throw the entire populations of the nations into the strife for their enrichment.

It is useless to imagine that a change of parties, a change of diplomatic method, will check the gigantic contest. The League of Nations itself will either remain a cipher or be used as an instrument in the hands of which ever power can succeed in dominating it.

The great Capitalists and Generals understand this: the world contest presents itself clearly to their minds. They prepare systematically and without compunction for the strife, arranging the wars in which the lives of millions will be sacrificed with the same coolness as Cabinet Ministers manipulate a general election or their wives organise bazaars. They believe the strife inevitable, and by this fatalism, divesting themselves of all sense of responsibility, they merely take what care they can to be on the winning side.

"Wars will never come to an end," says the supporter of Capitalism; but we who are Communists know otherwise. We know that wars will cease, but only with the downfall of the Capitalist system. We know, further, that with the downfall of the Capitalist system the coercion of nation by nation, class by class, by which the Government of present-day society is maintained, will also disappear. We know that no half-measures will suffice, and that the entire fabric of Capitalism must be swept away if its evils are to be eliminated. Communism and Capitalism cannot dwell together. There is no hope in eliminating merely the big Capitalist, for the small capitalist is continually growing with prosperity into the large capitalist.

Only complete Communism can save us from Capitalism, for Communism cannot exist as a half-measure. There must be:

Common ownership of the land, the means of production, distribution, transport, and communication, and management by councils of those who do the actual work.

Money, barter, and all forms of payment, and buying and selling, and wages must be abolished. Rationing of any sort can only be tolerated in case of scarcity. Each shall give according to his capacity, each shall use according to his needs.

Cont. from p. 1.

of a Commission acting under the Super-National Authority or League of Nations. It is further suggested that the peace of the world requires that the Dardanelles should be permanently and effectively neutralised and opened, like all the main lines of communication, under the control of the League of Nations freely to all nations without Customs duties.

This wicked policy, which was foisted on the 5,000,000 members of the Labour Party in Britain, and similar unconscious masses in France and Belgium, was never the policy

of the workers. It was the policy of the Allied Capitalist Governments.

Labour Party's Present Policy.

The manifesto just issued by the Labour Party National Joint Council is an example of the truth of Mr. Clynes' words that it is in method rather than in fundamental questions of policy that the Labour Party differs from the Government.

The Labour Party demands the internationalisation of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus and the creation of neutral zones around them. That this cuts up the country of the unfortunate Turks does not undermine their zeal for this solution.

Gibraltar.

Yet it does not occur to the Labour Party that the Straits of Gibraltar between Spain and Morocco, which the British wantonly seized for their own, should be internationalised or left to the countries on either side of it.

Suez.

The Labour Party does not suggest the internationalisation of the Suez Canal in Egypt, which is the only water passage from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea, and which the British control as well as Egypt itself, which they wantonly seized.

Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb.

The Labour Party does not ask the internationalisation of the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, between the Red Sea and the Arabian Sea. On one side of this Strait the British have seized the land from its natives, and on the other side the French.

Cattegat.

The Cattegat, between Denmark and Sweden, is another narrow sea which neither the Labour Party nor the Government propose to internationalise.

Straits of Dover.

The Labour Party does not propose to internationalise the Straits of Dover and to set up neutral zones on the neighbouring coasts of France and Britain.

Then there are the Sundu Straits, between Sumatra and Java, both belonging to the French. These are of importance to several neighbouring countries.

The Panama Canal.

No one talks of internationalising the Panama Canal, because the United States, standing by with a big stick, would know the reason why. The position regarding the Panama Canal, which is constructed with American capital, is that the Hay-Bureau-Varilla Treaty guarantees that the Republic of Panama, through which the canal passes, shall be maintained in independence of everything but the United States Government, which exercises a dominant power over it. The U.S. Government monopolises the inter-oceanic communication through Panama, both by rail and water; it controls the canal zone in perpetuity and, according to the Treaty, has the right to intervene in the Republic for the preservation of law and order. Last year United States troops were sent to Panama to enforce the United States view in settling a boundary dispute between Panama and its neighbouring Costa Rica.

The people of no country desire to have neutral zones controlled by foreign soldiers set up in their country, and the only excuse put forward for making neutral zones about the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus is that they were closed in the face of British warships coming to invade Turkey in the last war. Really it is difficult to know how even the British Labour Party can be so dense as to consider this an international reason for internationalising the Straits!

The Turks will not in the long run agree to have these neutral zones in their country. If they submit to them in face of superior force it will be only for a time.

(Continued on p. 8.)

Communist Workers' War Resistance Campaign.

The Communist Workers' Movement urges resistance to the war by every possible means.

Workers' Councils should be formed at the point of production, on the ships, in the docks and shipyards, the railway and tramway stations, in the factories, shops, and offices, and on the farms, etc., and by the women in every street, in order that the people may be organised to stop the war and abolish the Capitalist system and establish Communism.

The war is an outrageous crime and an appalling calamity: use it as a means of awaking the people to the iniquities of Capitalism and arousing them to action.

How to Act.

Every individual is called upon to act individually whilst endeavouring to secure collective action.

Make yourself responsible for giving the lead to those about you when a lead is required: let the workers see that it is no use waiting for Trade Union headquarters to instruct them, and that a rank and file organisation must be created.

Get into touch with the Industrial Secretary, "Workers' Dreadnought" Office, and get local groups of the All-Workers' Union of Revolutionary Workshop Councils formed. Send for War Resistance Literature to the "Workers' Dreadnought" Office.

Poster Parades.

Volunteer for poster parading on Saturdays, 11 a.m. and 3 p.m., starting from the "Workers' Dreadnought" Office, and at other times. Organise poster parades in your own district. Write to "Dreadnought" Office for War Resistance posters and handbills.

Open-Air Campaign.

Organise open-air meetings, and write for speakers, or volunteer for speaking, to C. Burn and C. T. West, at the "Workers' Dreadnought" Office.

Organise a house-to-house canvass in your locality, and write to "Dreadnought" Office for literature.

Volunteer for literature sales and distribution, chalking, poster parading, canvassing, speaking, etc.

Send a donation for the printing of free literature, etc., to N. L. Smyth, "Workers' Dreadnought" Office, 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

"Chains," poems, by S. Winsten. (C. W. Daniel, 5/-.) These poems are by a conscientious objector to the last War, and record his prison impressions. They are only too sadly appropriate to the present moment. We know nothing of the author: probably he does not write verse at ordinary times. The anguish of imprisonment, however, drove him to put his painful longings into words:

"He lifts the flag, and cuts my heart in two;
The whistle is my lone heart's cry for you.
The train moves on, and I must homeward go,
Through streets which I no longer seem to know."

NIGHT.

Night from her home of stars
Creeps through the iron bars
And throws her shadow net
To catch my cell in it.
She lifts it to the sky
To leave me there on high
To hear earth's moaning breath
Where all about is death.

THE CELL PEEP-HOLE.

I peeped into my comrade's cell,
And saw a naked figure there.
It lay outstretched in agony,
The cell was horror-grim and bare.
It groaned, but not a gentle word
Could reach, nor touch of human hand.
I peeped into my comrade's cell
And saw Death's spectre by him stand.

Cont. from p. 7.

The Labour Party will have to withdraw its support of the neutralising of the Straits, or make itself responsible for war with Turkey, sooner or later.

Thrace.

The Allied Governments took Thrace from Turkey and presented it to Greece at the close of the late war. The Labour Party made no protest at the time. Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, the "Daily Herald" editor, now calls the Greeks fire-eaters for wanting to keep the

territory ceded to them at the close of the war, and the Labour manifesto demands the evacuation of Eastern Thrace by the Greeks. The Greeks protest that they are dependent on Thrace for supplies of wheat, and that if Thrace goes back to Turkey the wheat, owing to tariffs and exchange, will be too costly for them to buy.

Such are the evils which fall upon the people under the Capitalist system. To benefit one person or section of people, a corresponding group must suffer injury. The Greeks desire the whole of Thrace, the Turks desire the whole of Thrace. Why should the Government of this country constitute itself the judge between them? Can the British Labour Party, with all its experience of the selfish chicanery of Capitalist Governments, of British Capitalist Governments, and of this British Capitalist Government, lend its support to the view that this Government, or the Allied Governments, or the League of Nations, should settle the present dispute, either by force or otherwise, and remain the military "guardian" of the Straits and the neutral zones?

The Labour Party has not used its power to prevent British troops from reaching the Dardanelles. It says, however, that it desires a conference to which Russia, Bulgaria, and Germany shall be invited, as well as the States to which the French, Italian, and British Governments have already issued invitations. The Labour Party would have acted with greater wisdom had it suggested that nations like Britain, France, and Italy, which are not situated in the neighbourhood, should remain out of the conference and refrain from interfering.

If France and Britain agree regarding this crisis, they will agree to oppress the other nations concerned which are weaker from the naval and military standpoint.

If France and Britain differ as to the solution, then we shall have another world war.

The Labour Party is assenting to the Government policy in all but minor details. Will the Labour Party continue to back the Government policy in all but minor details when the conference called by the Allies has announced its decision?

Parliament and the Crisis.

The Labour Party and the I.L.P. both call for the summoning of Parliament. The fact that Parliament has not been summoned, the fact that members of Parliament are not calling mass meetings and canvassing from door to door to ascertain the views of their constituents, and the fact that a General Election is not called should prove to every man and woman who did not realise it before that their part in the so-called "representative Government" of to-day is non-existent.

Nevertheless, when the present Parliament meets it will undoubtedly support the Government in its war measures: in any measure that the Government may declare necessary to maintain Imperial prestige and supremacy.

If the Labour Party and I.L.P. desire to show any practical belief in representative government they should demand a General Election.

The Communist View.

The Communist view is quite other than that of the Labour Party. We feel no solidarity with the Government and the Empire; our solidarity is with the workers and oppressed of all the world. We oppose every war of the Capitalist Government, on whatever pretext it may be fought. We desire not the meeting of Parliament but the Soviets.

LONDON OPEN-AIR CAMPAIGN.

COMMUNIST WORKERS' WAR RESISTANCE CAMPAIGN.

Thursday, Oct. 5th.—East India Dock Gates, 7 p.m., C. Burn, C. T. West.

Friday, Oct. 6th.—Outside Spratts, Morris Road, Poplar, 12 o'clock, C. T. West, C. Burn. Custom House Station, 5 p.m., C. Burn, C. T. West. Prince's Head, High Street, Battersea, 7.30 p.m., Mrs. Bolton, N. Smyth.

Saturday, Oct. 7th.—Beresford Square, 12 o'clock, T. Lewis, C. T. West. East India Dock Gates, 6 p.m., C. T. West, and others.

Sunday, Oct. 8th.—Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m., A. Jarvis, C. T. West, N. Smyth. Clapham Common, 3 p.m., Sylvia Pankhurst. Indoor Meeting.

Sunday, Oct. 8th.—Friar's Hall, 236 Blackfriar's Road (just over Blackfriar's Bridge), 7.30 p.m., Sylvia Pankhurst, and others.

DREADNOUGHT £500 FUND.

Brought forward, £288 8s. 1½d. A. J. Marriot, 2/6; F. Lawes, £1; H. Holt, 10/-; W. J. Paul, 7/6; W. Carter, 10/-; J. Blundell, 5/-; Portsmouth Communist Workers' Group, 2/- (monthly); Dr. Chandler, £2; M. Rimington, £1; F. Brimley (monthly), 10/-; C. Hart (monthly), 3/-; A Soldier Rebel, 2/6. Meetings: Clapham Common, 2/4½; Friar's Hall, 12/2½; H. G. Russell, 5/-; F. Haughton (monthly 10/-), £1; Pontefract, 10/-. Total for week, £9 2s. 1d. Total, £297 10s. 2½d.

HAVE YOU READ?

The Conquest of Bread, Peter Kropotkin, 2/-. Tells how life will be organised under Communism.
Fields, Factories, and Workshops, Peter Kropotkin, 2/-. Shows how Britain could be fed.
Mutual Aid, Peter Kropotkin, 2/-. Shows that Communism is a natural development.
Soviets or Parliament, Bucharin, 1d. Compares the Parliamentary system with the Soviets.
Erewhon, or Over the Range, by Samuel Butler, 1/-. A story of Communism.
The War of Steel and Gold, H. N. Brailsford, 1/4. A brilliant study of the causes of war.
Hugo Stinnes, by Hermann Bruick Mayer, 7/6. Traces the development of post-war German Capitalism and the intense trustification now proceeding in Germany.
War, by Peter Kropotkin 2d.
Appeal to the Young, by Peter Kropotkin 2d.
The World's Revolutions, by Untermann 3/6
The Evolution of Man, by Bodsche 3/6
Eighteenth Brumaire, by Karl Marx 3/6
Revolution and Counter-Revolution, by Karl

Published by E. Sylvia Pankhurst at 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4, and printed by S. Carie at 10 Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT



One Penny Weekly.