

KNOWLEDGE MUST PRECEDE ALL INTELLIGENT ACTION

ORGANISE

THE WORKER

EDUCATE

THE ORGAN OF WORKERS' COMMITTEES SCOTLAND



Edited by JOHN S. CLARKE

No. 64.

FEBRUARY 7, 1920.

Price 2d.

THE REVOLUTION OF THE PROLETARIAT and KAUTSKY, THE RENEGADE

(Special to "The Worker.")

By N. LENIN

INTRODUCTION.

Kautsky's brochure, "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat," recently published in Vienna (Diktator des Proletariats," Vienna, Ignaz Brand. pp. 63), constitutes the palpable example of the complete and utter bankruptcy of the Second International, concerning which all honest Socialists would have already some time ago expressed their opinion. The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat has now become in many States a practical question. It is therefore necessary to direct criticism against Kautsky's renegade sophistries and his desertion of Marxism.

Of all, it may be as well to emphasise the writer of these lines had already in the beginning of the war frequent occasion to point out Kautsky's deviations from Marxism. A series of essays, 1914-1916, in the foreign papers, "The Social Democrat" and "The Communist," were devoted to this purpose. These essays were collected and published by the Petrograd Soviet in a pamphlet entitled "Against the Stream," by G. Zinoviev and N. Lenin (Petrograd, 1918. pp. 550). In a brochure published in Geneva in 1915, which appeared also in French and German translations, I wrote as follows about "Kautsky's

Kautsky, the foremost authority of the Second International, is a highly typical and an example of the manner in which a verbal distortion of Marxism may in reality pass into 'Struvinism' or 'Brentanism' (i.e., a non-revolutionary conception, which recognises no revolutionary class war, and which was clearly enunciated by the Russian author, Struve, and the German economist, Brentano). This also to be observed in Plekhanov. The revolutionary spirit of Marxism is reduced down with patent sophistries, everywhere it is recognised **except** its revolutionary nature and its propaganda for these and for the education of the masses in that direction. The complete lack of principle, Kautsky 'represents' the basic ideas of social chauvinism, the recognition of national defence in the present war, with a diplomatic, apparent concession to the Left in the form of a refusal to vote on the question of credit, while emphasising the opposition character of the party, Kautsky, who in the year 1909 wrote a whole book on the coming revolutionary epoch and the connection between war and revolution; Kautsky, who in 1913 signed the Basle Manifesto with its demands that the coming war should be exploited for the revolution, now only defends and glorifies social chauvinism, like Plekhanov, he now joins the bour-

geoisie, and meets every thought of revolution, every step towards direct revolutionary struggle with nothing but scorn.

"The working class cannot realise its world revolutionary mission without fighting this spirit of apostasy, this lack of character and exaggerated servility towards this opportunism, this monstrous defilement of Marxism. Kautskyism is no accident, but the social outcome of the contradiction in the Second International which sought to combine a formal recognition of the truth of Marxism in words with an obedient observance of opportunism in deeds." ("Socialism and War," by J. Zinoviev and N. Lenin. Geneva, 1915. pp. 13).

Later, in the book, "Imperialism—the most recent development of Capitalism" (written in 1916 and published in Petrograd in 1917), I pointed out in detail the theoretical galleys underlying Kautsky's statements on Imperialism. I referred to Kautsky's definition of Imperialism: "Imperialism is the product of highly developed Capitalism. It consists of the efforts of every industrially Capitalistic nation to combine with or force under its control the more extensive agrarian areas (Kautsky's italics) without reference to the nationalities inhabiting these areas." I pointed out the complete erroneousness of this definition, and how it had been "constructed" to obliterate the deepest contradictions inherent in Imperialism and to build a bridge to opportunism. I quoted his definition of Imperialism: "Imperialism is Capitalism in that stage of development during which the foundations of the sovereignty of monopoly and financial capital are laid, when the export of capital is of decisive importance and the division of the earth among international trusts is begun, while its division among the most powerful Capitalist countries is concluded." I proved that Kautsky's criticism of Imperialism stands even lower than its criticism by the bourgeoisie.

Finally, in August and September, 1917, i.e., before the proletarian revolution in Russia (25th October—7th November, 1917), I wrote the brochure "State and Revolution. The Marxist doctrine on the State and the duties of the proletariat in the revolution," which was published in Petrograd in the beginning of 1918. In Chapter VI. of this book, on the vulgarisation of Marxism by opportunism, I devoted special attention to Kautsky and proved that he had completely distorted Marx's teaching, and corrupted it into opportunism "to refrain from revolution in acts, but to recognise it in words."

In the main, Kautsky's essential theoretic mistake in his pamphlet on the dictatorship of the proletariat consists just of these opportunistic perversions of Marx's doctrine of the State,

which have been thoroughly exposed in my brochure, "State and Revolution."

These introductory remarks have been necessary to show that I accused Kautsky of being a renegade long before the Bolsheviks seized State power, and Kautsky condemned them for so doing.

HOW KAUTSKY TURNS MARX INTO A COMMON-PLACE LIBERAL.

The question that above all occupies Kautsky in his pamphlet is the question of the real substance of the proletarian revolution, namely, that of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This question is of the utmost importance in all countries, particularly the leading and the belligerent countries, and especially at the present time. Without exaggeration, one may say that this is the most important of all questions for the proletarian class war. It is therefore necessary to examine it with attention.

Kautsky puts the matter as follows: "The contrast between the two Socialist movements (Bolsheviks and non-Bolsheviks) is a contrast between two fundamentally different methods—those of democracy and of dictatorship." (p. 3).

In passing, it may be observed that Kautsky, when he calls Russian non-Bolsheviks (i.e., Mensheviks and Social Democrats) Socialists, he goes by their names, i.e., a word, but not by the position they really occupy in the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. A glorious understanding and adaptation of Marxism! But of this, more later. Better go straight to the point: Kautsky's wonderful discovery of the "fundamental difference between the methods of democracy and dictatorship." Herein lies the essence of the question, the kernel of Kautsky's pamphlet. It bears witness to such an extraordinary confusion of theory, such complete apostasy from Marxism, that it must be recognised that Kautsky far exceeds Bernstein.

The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the question of the relations between the proletarian and the bourgeois States. This would appear to be obvious. But like a history teacher who has dried up from constant lecturing. Kautsky, for quite the hundredth time, turns his back on the 20th Century, and his face towards the 18th, and with incredible dullness remasticates incessantly in a whole string of paragraphs old stuff about the relations of bourgeois democracy to absolutism and the Middle Ages.

He is, indeed, chewing his old night-cap in his sleep.

It is a case of not even understanding what it is about. Kautsky's exertions to make it appear that there are people who preach "con-

tempt for democracy" (p. 11) and the like, are merely ludicrous. With such cheap phrases, Kautsky has to smudge and complicate the question; for he words it as the Liberals do: democracy in general, and not bourgeois democracy. He even rejects this definite class conception and makes attempts to speak of "pre-Socialist" democracy. Nearly a third of the pamphlet, 20 out of 60 pages, is occupied with the like twaddle, pleasant enough for the bourgeoisie, since it means placing a different construction on bourgeois democracy and shuffles off the whole question of the revolution of the proletariat.

"However, the title of Kautsky's brochure is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. It is well known that this is just the kernel of Marx's doctrine. After having chattered round and round the subject, Kautsky is driven to quote Marx on the dictatorship of the proletariat. The way in which he, Kautsky, the "Marxist," does this is obvious imposition.

"This conception (presented by Kautsky as contempt for democracy) is based on one single word of Karl Marx"—quoting literally from p. 20. On p. 60 this is repeated in the following form: Then they (the Bolsheviks) remembered at the right moment the little word (Wortchen) about the dictatorship of the proletariat which Marx had once used in a letter in 1875."

Here is Marx's "Wortchen":

"Between the Capitalist and Communist orders of society lies a period during which the former passes over into the latter. Corresponding to this period there is a political transition stage, during which the State can only be formed of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

To begin with: to call this famous statement of Marx, which summarises his whole revolutionary doctrine, "a word" or "a little word" is to make a mockery of Marxism and to deny its completeness. It must not be forgotten that Kautsky knows Marx by heart, that, judging from his writings, he has accumulated in his desk or in his head, a quantity of drawers where all Marx's statements are arranged in the most convenient and accurate manner for purposes of quotation. Kautsky cannot be ignorant of the fact that both Marx and Engels repeatedly referred in letters as in publications to the dictatorship of the proletariat, both before and after the Commune. Kautsky cannot be ignorant of the use of the formula, "the dictatorship of the proletariat" as a more historically-concrete and scientifically accurate term for the obligation of the proletariat to "crush" the bourgeois machinery of State, an obligation which both Marx and Engels, taught by the experience of the 1848 revolution and still more of the 1871 revolution, discussed from 1852 to 1891, a period of forty years. How is one to explain this curious distortion of Marxism by its pundit Kautsky? The philosophic basis of the phenomenon lies in a secret exchange of dialectics for eclecticism and sophistry. Kautsky is a pastmaster at effecting such secret exchange. In terms of practical politics it is a piece of flunkey work for opportunism, and therefore at bottom for the bourgeoisie. When war broke out, Kautsky attained great proficiency in this part of professing Marxism, while acting as the lackey of the bourgeoisie. Since then his development in this direction has been more and more rapid.

One becomes even more convinced of this on noticing Kautsky's curious "interpretation" of Marx's "little word" on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Marx has unfortunately omitted to indicate more closely how he conceives this dictatorship. (A thoroughly mendacious renegade remark, for Marx and Engels gave a number of the most minute indications, which are intentionally ignored by the pundit of Marxism, Kautsky). . . . But taken literally it also means power in the hands of one single person who is subject to no laws. The autocracy of a single man, distinguished from despotism, in that, it is conceived, not as a permanent institution, but as a transitory emergency measure. The expression "the dictatorship of the proletariat," i.e., not dictatorship of one man but of a class, excludes the possibility that Marx was thinking of a dictatorship in the literal

sense of the term. He was speaking, not of a form of government, but of a state of affairs which must necessarily arise wherever the proletariat seizes the power. A proof that he had no form of government in mind is found in his belief that the transition could take place peacefully in England and America, that is to say on democratic lines" (p. 20).

This statement has been quoted intentionally so that the reader may clearly see the methods adopted by the "theorist" Kautsky.

Kautsky wished to approach the question in this way, in order that he might begin with a definition of the "word" dictatorship.

Excellent. It is the inalienable right of one and all to approach the question in what way they please. Only it is essential to distinguish between a serious and honest treatment of the question and a dishonest one. He who wishes to treat a question in a certain way ought to give his definition of "the words," so that a clear and straightforward statement of the question is obtained. Kautsky does not do this. "Literally"—he writes—the word dictatorship means "the overthrow of democracy."

To begin with, this is no definition. If, like Kautsky, one avoids defining the idea of dictatorship, why choose this method of approaching the question?

Secondly, it is patently inaccurate. A liberal, of course, talks of "democracy" in general. The Marxist does not forget to ask "for which class?" For instance, everyone—including the "historian" Kautsky—knows that slave revolts and slave movements in the past exposed the main foundation of the classical state, namely, the dictatorship of the slave-rulers. Can it be contended that this dictatorship overthrew the democracy among the slave-rulers, for them? It is known to all that this was not the case.

The "Marxist" Kautsky is responsible here for a strange, meaningless and untruthful statement, for he "forgot" the class-war. In order to turn this liberal and deceptive assertion of Kautsky's into one that is Marxist and veracious, it should be worded more as follows: dictatorship does not necessarily mean the overthrow of democracy for the class exercising it against other classes, but it does necessarily involve the overthrow (or the utmost limitation, also a feature of overthrow) of democracy for the class over or against which dictatorship is exercised.

But, true as the above assertion may be, it gives no definition of dictatorship.

Let us now turn to the consideration of the following statement of Kautsky's:

"But taken literally, this word means power in the hands of one single person who is subject to no laws."

Like a blind puppy poking his nose now this way, now that, Kautsky has accidentally hit on one true idea (that dictatorship is a power subject to no laws), but all the same he gives no definition of dictatorship, and is also guilty of an obvious historical untruth in asserting that person. This is even grammatically inaccurate, dictatorship means the power of one single person for a dictatorship may be exercised by a number of persons, an oligarchy, a class, etc.

Later Kautsky explains the difference between dictatorship and despotism, but although his explanation is completely incorrect, we shall not dilate upon it, as it is of no interest to the matter in hand. It is clear that Kautsky is drawn from the 20th to the 18th century and from the 18th to classical times, and we hope that the German proletariat which believes in dictatorship will appoint him as lecturer in ancient history. To avoid defining the dictatorship of the proletariat by presenting platitudes on despotism must either be the most exquisite stupidity or very clumsy deception.

CONCLUSION.

The conclusion we arrive at is that Kautsky in speaking of dictatorship utters a number of conscientious untruths, but gives no definition. Perhaps he does not depend upon his intellectual capacity, but resorts to his memory to take out of the "drawers" all the quotations in which Marx speaks of dictatorship. He would then certainly obtain either the following definition, or one which in the main agrees with it:—

Dictatorship is a power resting directly on

force and subject to no laws.

The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is a power seized by might of the proletariat and exercised by it against the bourgeoisie, a power subject to no laws.

This is the single truth. It is a clear day to every conscious worker (representative of the masses, and not the top layer of petit bourgeoisie which has been bought by the Capitalists and is formed of Social-Republicans in all countries), it is patent to every representative of the exploited who fights for deliverance, and an incontestable truth to every Marxist that one must "fight to get free" from that learned gentleman, Kautsky. How plain this? The explanation lies in the spirit of flunkeyism that pervaded the leaders of the Second International, despised sycophants in the service of the bourgeoisie.

First Kautsky tries, too stupidly, to shuffle the cards, as if the literal meaning of the word dictatorship was dictatorship by a single person, and then, again trying to shuffle the cards, he pretends that Marx's words on dictatorship are not to be taken literally, only to be interpreted so that dictatorship is not synonymous with the exercise of reactionary force, but with a "peaceful capturing the majority from the bourgeoisie—via democracy—be it noted."

It is, he says, a case of distinguishing between "a state of affairs" and "a form of government." An astonishing and profound distinction, very much as if we were to distinguish the "state" of stupidity in a person who speaks foolishly from the "form" of stupidity. Kautsky has to interpret dictatorship as the "state of ruling" (this expression occurs literally on his 21st page), for this includes revolutionary violence and violent revolution. "The state of domination" is a state of affairs under which any chance major is for—"democracy." By means of deceptions like these the whole revolution is successfully excluded.

But the deception is a trifle too gross, cannot save Kautsky. It is not to be denied that dictatorship assumes and involves a "state of affairs" which is disagreeable to those who deny revolutionary violence exercised by class against another. The emptiness of distinction between "state of affairs" and "form of government" becomes obvious, speak here of "form of government" is too stupid, for every child knows that monarchy and republic are different forms of government. It is necessary to make it plain to Kautsky that both these forms of government, like all other forms of government in the Capitalist era, are in the main only different forms of the bourgeois state, that is to say dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Finally, to speak here of "forms of government" is not only stupid, but a clumsy falsification of Marx, who makes it more than clear that he is referring here to forms or to the State, not to forms of government.

The revolution of the proletariat is impossible unless the machinery of the bourgeois State is destroyed by force, and replaced by another, which, according to Engels, is the State in the literal sense.

Kautsky has to deform and distort in order to maintain his renegade position. Let us examine his wretched dodges!

Dodge number one.—"A proof that no form of government in mind is found in belief that the transition could take place peacefully in England and America, that is to say on democratic lines."

In this case the form of government has no significance, for it may be either monarchy when it is not typical of the bourgeoisie, e.g., if it is distinguished by the absence of militarism, or republicanism, and in this case completely typical, e.g., with militarism and bureaucracy. Kautsky dare not judge this well-known historical and political fact. If Kautsky had wished to treat the subject seriously and honestly, he should have asked himself: "Are there any historical laws referring to revolutions and to which there are no exceptions?" And the answer would have been: "No, there are no such laws." Such laws are perhaps typical, as Marx once called them "ideal," with an average, normal type of Capitalism in mind.

Further! Were there any circumstances in the 70's that might lead to the placing of England and America in a special category? To anyone who is at all acquainted with scientific demands in questions of history, it is obvious that such a question must be raised: Not to raise it is to falsify knowledge and play with sophistry. But once the question has been raised, there can be no doubt as to the answer: "The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat involves the exercise of force against the bourgeoisie, and this force is found to be especially necessary as Marx and Engels have frequently and explicitly shown (especially in 'Civil War in France' and the preface of that book), in countries where militarism and bureaucracy exist." When Marx made his statement, these phenomena did not exist in England and America in the 70's or the 19th Century. (But now they exist, both in England and America).

Kautsky is literally compelled to deception at every step in order to cover his apostasy.

Note how quite unexpectedly he sticks out his asses' ears! He writes: "Peacefully—that is to say, on democratic lines!"

When it is a case of defining dictatorship, Kautsky exerts himself to the utmost to keep back from the reader the chief characteristic of this conception, namely, revolutionary violence. But now it comes to the fore indeed—the question is one of the difference between peaceful and violent revolution.

There lies the root of the matter. All Kautsky's dodging, sophistries, deceitful distortions, serve the purpose of talking away violent revolution, of concealing his denial of it, his change-over to Liberal working class policy, i.e., to the bourgeoisie. Here indeed is the root of the matter.

The "historian," Kautsky, distorts history with such impudence that he forgets the chief point—that pre-monopolist Capitalism, which reached its highest development in the 70's of the 19th Century, was distinguished by the radical strength of its economic character, which found most typical expression in England and America as relatively the most peace-and-freedom-loving countries. But the pronounced economic characteristics of Imperialism, i.e., monopolist Capitalism, which definitely reaches its full development only in the 20th Century, are far from peace-and-freedom-loving; on the contrary, the development of militarism has been promoted everywhere to the greatest extent. "Not to notice" this when discussing the nature and possibilities of peaceful or violent revolution means stooping

to perform the meanest of services for the bourgeoisie.

Dodge number two! The Paris Commune realised the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it was chosen by universal suffrage, i.e., without depriving the bourgeoisie of its right to vote, i.e., it was democratic. And Kautsky triumphantly says: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is to Marx (or according to Marx) a State which necessarily arises out of pure democracy if the proletariat forms the majority" (bei überwiegendem Proletariat, p. 21).

This proof of Kautsky's is so utterly ludicrous that it provides a veritable embarrassment of riches (of objections to be raised). To begin with, it is well known that the flower of the bourgeoisie, its staff and upper layers, fled from Paris to Versailles. At Versailles lived the "Socialist," Louis Blanc, which incidentally proves the mendacity of Kautsky's assertion that "all sections" of Socialism took part in the Commune. Is it not absurd to represent the division of the population of Paris into two camps, in one of which was concentrated all the martially trained and politically active bourgeoisie as "pure democracy" with "universal suffrage."

Is it not clear that Kautsky writes in a country where the police prohibit "general" laughter, for otherwise Kautsky would have been killed by laughter?

Thirdly, I permit myself respectfully to remind Herr Kautsky, who knows his Marx and Engels by heart, of the following criticism of the Commune by Engels, bearing "pure democracy" in mind:—

"Had they ever seen a revolution, these gentlemen (anti-authority men)? A revolution is certainly the most authoritative thing there is. Revolution is an act, whereby part of the population enforces its will on another part with arms, bayonets and cannon, that is to say, with most authoritative means. The party that conquers must maintain its authority by the terror its arms exercise over the reactionary. If the Paris Commune had not made use of the authority of an armed people against the bourgeoisie, would it have lasted more than a day? On the contrary, can we not blame it for too small a use of such authority?"

There you have "pure democracy!" What derision Engels poured on the common-place bourgeoisie, "the Social-Democrat" (in the French sense of the forties, the European of 1914-1918) who thought of speaking of "pure democracy" in general, in a society divided into classes.

Well, that is enough. To enumerate all the

platitudes Kautsky invents is impossible, for his every phrase lays bare a bottomless abyss of the spirit of apostasy.

Marx and Engels gave a most detailed examination of the Paris Commune, they showed that its chief merit was the attempt to destroy and crush the "existing apparatus of State." Marx and Engels thought this conclusion so significant that only this correction was included in 1872 in the partly "obsolete" Communist manifesto. Marx and Engels showed that the Commune uprooted the army and bureaucracy, destroyed **Parliamentarism**, annihilated that "parasitic growth—the State," etc., but the over-wise Kautsky sits and repeats, what has been repeated a thousand times by Liberal professors—fairy tales about "pure democracy."

Well might Rosa Luxemburg say on 4th August, 1914, that the German Social-Democrats are now a **decaying corpse**.

Dodge number three.—"If we speak of dictatorship as a form of government, we cannot talk of the dictatorship of a class. For a class can, as we have already remarked, only rule, but not govern. But 'organisations' or 'parties' govern."

Shuffle away, sir, "councillor of confusion." Dictatorship is no form of government—what ridiculous nonsense. Marx does not speak of a form of government, but of the form or type of the State. And that is by no means the same thing. Besides, it is decidedly incorrect that a class cannot govern; such stuff can only be served up by a cretin of parliamentarism who sees nothing but the bourgeois parliament, notices nothing but the ruling parties. Any European country will provide Kautsky with an example of a ruling class which governs, i.e., the landowners in the middle of the century, independently of the fact that they were insufficiently organised.

Summa Summarum.—Kautsky distorts the dictatorship of the proletariat in the most unexampled manner by turning Marx into a common-place Liberal who chews the end of insipid phrases about "pure democracy," while he seeks to adorn and conceal the class nature of bourgeois democracy because he has the utmost fear of revolutionary violence on the part of the oppressed class. When Kautsky "interprets" the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat in this way, leaving out revolutionary violence on the part of the oppressed class against the oppressors, bourgeois distortion of Marx has in truth attained a world record. The renegade, Bernstein, is but a puppy by the side of the renegade, Kautsky.

THE DOCKERS' COURT OF INQUIRY.

On January 28th and 29th, Liverpool was visited by Lord Shaw, Sir Lionel Fletcher, and Mr. Harry Gosling, members of the Transport Workers' Court of Inquiry. According to the press reports, it was stated that these gentlemen were visiting a number of ports with a view of ascertaining for themselves the actual working conditions on the docks. No one would doubt that such an object as theirs would be a very commendable one, but one fears that in view of the information received in regard to their visit that their object was not attained.

As the above fact had been advertised beforehand, needless to say a great deal of interest had been created, particularly among the dockers. The Mersey Dockers' Vigilance Committee—a body recently formed with a view to forwarding the interests of the rank and file—discussed the position, and carried a resolution to the effect that arrangements should be made for men who had an actual knowledge of the working conditions to accompany the deputation along the line of docks. Four were appointed as delegates—men with an experience of over twenty years in this class of work. The resolution was forwarded to the proper quarter, but no reply was received—not even an acknowledgment of the letter. Such is the treatment meted out to the rank and file when they have any proposal to put forward.

The Committee sat last Saturday, and some very interesting reports were received as to what had transpired during the visit of the

deputation to the docks. It would appear that on the Wednesday afternoon a casual visit was paid to the ship repairing and coaling docks. Thursday morning the deputation appeared on the stands of a well known shipping company. Their coming had been duly notified, for on the previous day a large number of men had been engaged in the cleaning up, whitewashing, etc., of the sheds of this particular firm. At the usual time the "putter on" appeared on the stands, and on this occasion, mark you, all the men on the stand were taken on. Possibly it was a coincidence, for the previous day not less than 50 men were turned away, and on the following day men were turned away. As to the reason why all men were taken on, I shall leave the gentle reader to decide for himself. The result of taking such a large number of men was that the number of men engaged in each hatch was considerably increased, for in one hatch where six and eight men were usually employed, fourteen and sixteen men were on the scene that day. As a consequence of the above, the deputation appeared to be quite satisfied with the methods adopted. The deputation was accompanied by members of the Port of Liverpool Employers' Association in their visits, though it is understood that on one occasion they were accompanied by the General Secretary of the Dockers' Union.

On Thursday evening the local press informed the public that the deputation had left Liverpool for London that afternoon, apparently well satisfied with the result of their investigations. However well they may be satisfied, this incident has created a great deal

of discontent among the dockers, and it has opened the eyes of many to see the way that things are being done. Next week the Court of Inquiry will hold a number of public meetings, and we trust that the dockers will keep an eagle eye upon these proceedings. The time for camouflaging, whether by Employers, Union Officials, or any other body, must cease. Dockers of all ports must follow the example of the Liverpool and Glasgow dockers by forming their rank and file committees with a view of co-operation on this matter. The time for Action has come.

"DOCKER."

W. PAUL'S APOLOGY TO J. S. CLARKE.

Comrade W. Paul addressed a large and enthusiastic meeting at Clydebank last Sunday. He deputised in place of Comrade J. S. Clarke. The lecture was a lantern one, and the speaker with the aid of splendid lantern slides graphically described the martyrdom and triumph of Russian Labour. In the course of the meeting Comrade Paul said he wished as a member of the S.L.P., as the person honoured by the Paisley S.L.P., to carry the red banner of revolutionary Socialism in that town at the election, and as one who recently resigned the editorship of the "Socialist," a post occupied by him for over four years, to publicly apologise to Comrade J. S. Clarke for the ungracious and undignified attack made upon him in the current issue of the "Socialist." He yielded to no one in the need for criticism, but criticism was an entirely different thing from abuse and scurrility.



February 7, 1920.

All communications to be sent to the Editor, National Council's Offices, 31 North Frederick Street, Glasgow.

Subscribers' Rates—Weekly, 2½d.; Quarterly, 2s. 8d.; Half-yearly, 5s. 4d. (post free).

THE HUNGARIAN BUTCHERS.

The Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party has just addressed the following two letters to Comrade Lorient and the French proletariat:—

Dear Comrades,

The Hungarian Communist Party, after its collapse of the 15th of August, due solely to the military pressure of the Entente, organised itself and recommenced its work. Its most urgent task is to get help to those Hungarian Comrades who have fallen into the hands of the counter-revolutionary executioners. Unhappily, only too many of those unfortunate comrades have already been put beyond reach of all human succour by the butchers. In the Trans-Danube forests of gibbets mark the passage of the "national and Christian" army of Admiral Hortky. The "gentlemanly" officers hung "inadvertently" a few hundred innocent people, recognised as such by their own official reports of proceedings. At Keskemet, the mutilated corpses of 120 of their victims have just been exhumed. The non-participation of these unfortunate people in the Communist movement was so evident that the official report itself had to describe this hecatomb as simple murder. The suspects were carried off by force by a band of the national army, taken by night into a neighbouring wood, and massacred by hatchet blows by "gentlemanly and Christian" officers, after having had the sacraments administered by a priest who had been invited beforehand to perform this melancholy office. They were then interred on the spot.

It was only when several corpses which had been badly interred were discovered by the peasants of the neighbourhood and identified by the families, and when public opinion demanded insistently an immediate inquiry, that the authorities ordered a tardy investigation. But the irritation had acted on public opinion in a manner little favourable to similar exploits on the part of the white guard. The Hungarian Government therefore bethought themselves of another method less odious in appearance, but none the less sure, to exterminate the elements dangerous to the Capitalist and feudal domination. Witnesses—tortured or corrupted—offered their evidence for a series of political trials, which resulted in 23 being condemned to death, of whom 14 were executed 2 days after the sentence. A fortunate circumstance came to preserve the lives of 14 other comrades for a week longer, for the Christian hangmen do not execute anyone during Christmas week. It is with the object of trying to save our unfortunate comrades that we address ourselves to you in the name of the world solidarity of the proletariat. We beseech our French comrades to protest by every means to their Government against these legal and illegal murders.

But besides these direct murders, sentences of imprisonment, which are unthinkable in their ferocity, have been pronounced against those of our comrades who performed any function whatsoever under the Commune. That was still not enough. The Hungarian Government has decided to intern all those whom, even with the assistance of witnesses tortured by the white inquisition, they have not been able to accuse of any offence, but who are simply suspected of Communist, Socialist, or even radical, sentiments. It has been decided to intern them in the camp of Hajmasker, a military camp, which served during the war as an isolation centre for

CIGARETTE PAPERS

By JOHN S. CLARKE

I am aware that many object to the severity of my language, the coarseness of my invective, and the precipitancy of my measures, but is there not cause for severity? I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice.—William Lloyd Garrison.

WHAT YOU "PRODUCE" FOR. WHY "INCREASE"?

We have had occasion to mention the "People's Politics" once or twice in these columns. Apparently there has only been one issue of that delectable production, or we have missed the subsequent issues, which is hardly likely. The number we did see was mainly concerned in pointing out that rich people were mostly poor people who had an extraordinary difficult time of it trying to make ends meet. "It is a mistake," said the editor, "for Socialists to believe that the rich spend their money on yachting cruises, motor tours and similar extravagances." Then followed a table to prove that the bloodsuckers who suck Labour were sucked in turn by the State until one could easily see that the only possessing class in society were those who were originally dispossessed by the rich-poor. Frankly, we are not good either at manufacturing paradoxes or at understanding them. We know thundering well that Labour is always in a state of chronic poverty, that Labour produces all wealth, that the wealth it produces is far in excess of its requirements, and consequently, apart altogether from Karl Marx or Bolshevism, something or somebody must be doing the dirty across Labour. We have never seen any reference to the kind of productive labour engaged in by these people of whom the "London Mail" (Jan. 31st) tells us:—

The Prince of Wales, who is up to his eyes in engagements, went to Sandringham for a few days' shooting last week.

Lady Patricia Ramsay, our most travelled Royalty, is off to Cannes to join her father at the Hotel Californie as soon as she and the baby are quite fit.

Although there are a good many popular members of society in London, others are far away at Murren, Cannes, Nice, Mentone, and Biarritz, yet crowds of the well-knowns have been in the country enjoying the hunt balls and all sorts of country gaieties.

Remember, reader, these people produce **nothing** (Princess Pat has certainly produced a baby, and a baby is alright of course, but it will never get beyond the sucking stage. If it reaches the age of sixty and Bolshevism is not, that baby will be still sucking—Labour.) They produce nothing that adds to the universal wealth or welfare. Perhaps when they come back from Cannes, Murren, Nice, etc., they will get their fur coats off—"When the King and Queen come back to London for what promises to be a gay season they will make arrangements for Courts. Everyone hopes that there will be real Courts, and that these garden parties will only be thrown in casually."

Just a casual garden-party—they are such a demitison bore—"thrown in" to make weight, a trifle, a sort of stop-gap for the sake of the hoary-headed and half-dead duchesses, etc., whose avoirdupois prohibits them from tripping it in the "real Courts."

From Ireland I hear that many members of society have gone abroad for the winter.

infectious diseases. Here in this camp is penned up the crowd of those who are guilty of no crime and who are not even accused of any. They have been shut up with their wives and children, condemned by a simple ministerial decree to a worse slavery than any during the most barbarous of the middle ages.

The letters go on to appeal to the proletariat of Europe to bring any and every pressure to bear on their Governments to force the cessation of the persecution.

Trans. by A. W. ("La Vie Ouvriere")

So crowded are the boats bound for England that it is difficult to get a berth.

Lady M'Calmont has left Mount Juliet, and—lucky woman!—is bound for Florida. She leaves her son and daughter-in-law at Mount Juliet to enjoy their courting and to look after the greyhounds and all the rest. Lady Milbanke has not been tempted to leave Mullaboden, but, then she has been making things jolly there for her elder son John, the boy baronet who was 18 the other day.

No pleasure without pain, you see. Think of the tremendous responsibilities of having to look after greyhounds with only a score or two flunkies to assist you! But the tit-bit, reader, is to come. The activities of the anti-Bolsheviks, as outlined above, are the mere every-day, hum-drum affairs. They need a tonic now and then to enable them to survive—to make them fit in order to heroically face the next day's debauch of idleness and utter uselessness. Some of 'em get it—

Any man about town has known for months past that immoral films were being shown in private, and there are few of us who have not been invited to see one. It is difficult to know how the police can stop them except by someone turning common informer after receiving an invitation. This I can say, that from all I hear these privately shown films are not only disgusting and demoralising to the last degree—**outdoing the foul photographs which used to come from Cairo**—but that there would be an outcry if the names of some of the wealthy degenerates who pay for them, and invite mixed audiences to witness them, became known.

Enough! In spite of the "People's Politics"; in spite of the venal Brownlie, Clynes, Hodge, Brace and Thomas; in spite of the entire Labour Party, we exhort the workers to **stop production**, or to hinder it as much as possible until this filthy, idle, absolutely useless, and socially pestiferous gang of wasters called the "upper class" are compelled to justify their existence on earth by **work**—as they have been compelled in Russia.

THE DEATH ROLL OF HONOUR.

In contradiction to the life led by the parasites as depicted in the above paragraphs, we append from the Ministry of Labour returns, the death roll for December (the latest figures available). There is an increase of 23 on the previous figures. The total is 265 reported, made up as follows:—

Railway Service	45
Mines	87
Quarries	3
Factories and Workshops	103
Accidents under Factory Acts	24
Accidents under Accidents Acts	3

Total, excluding seamen, ... 265

Added to the above, one must add the shipwrecks and other deaths **not reported**, as well as the accidents, diseases, etc., due to industrial conditions. Some for December, reported to the Home Office, are—

Diseases of Occupations.

Lead Poisoning	19
Painting and Plumbing	3
Other Poisoning	2
Anthrax	4

28

MORE DETAILS.

And while the non-producers are cavorting around the world having a "jolly time" of

it, or watching obscene films in London, or doping and divorcing and infecting the "lower classes" with venereal disease. And while the workers are being killed or maimed, poisoned and paralysed in order that the above might be possible in this home of democracy—pauperism increases month by month—

"The number of paupers relieved on one day in December, 1919, in 35 selected areas corresponded to a rate of 132 per 10,000 of population, showing an increase of 2 per 10,000 on the previous month, and of 7 per 10,000 on a year ago."—"Labour Gazette."

And the class struggle increases in intensity in spite of Labour leaders who "don't believe in a class struggle." From the same source:—

"The number of trade disputes beginning in December was 61, as compared with 42 in the previous month and 51 in December, 1918. In these new disputes nearly 29,000 workpeople were directly and about 3500 workpeople indirectly involved (i.e., thrown out of work at the establishments where the disputes occurred, though not themselves parties to the disputes). In addition, nearly 72,000 workpeople were involved, either directly or indirectly, in 46 disputes which began before December, and were still in progress at the beginning of that month. The total number of disputes in progress in December was thus 107, involving about 105,000 workpeople, as compared with over 93,000 workpeople involved in disputes in progress in November, 1919, and nearly 150,000 in December, 1918."

THE QUEENSBURY RULES.

A good "sport" always hits his adversary above the belt. A coward, a ruffian, or a bully (they are pretty much the same thing) strikes below, or from behind with a weapon. The ethics of debate ought to be similar to those obtaining in the prize ring, but even more stringent. There are intellectual sewer-rats, particularly in politics, who can only crawl up behind an opponent and dig filthy little teeth into him. We are assured by Lady Bonham-Carter that Mr. Asquith is not one of these latter. We are not going to dispute with the lady, but after watching the antics of Lady Astor during the Plymouth bye-election, we are not surprised at the idea which aristocratic ladies of other political camps seem to hold concerning the ethics of debate. "The fault which I deplore most in Mr. Asquith," says Lady Bonham-Carter, "is that he always hits above the belt."

With these kind of notions dominating this feminine mentality one wonders what kind of a caboose the "House" will be when fifty or sixty aristocratic "ladies" are returned as members.

SHE SAYS IT, TOO.

It is quite a commonplace observation to aver that if Papa Asquith is defeated at Paisley, it spells the knock-out to the already decrepit frame of the once powerful and treacherous Liberalism—and the political grave of Asquith himself. His garrulous daughter, the Lady Bonham-Carter, admits this herself:—

"We must realise that there is something greater at stake than the Liberalism of Paisley. The life of Liberalism itself is at stake. All eyes are focused on this stage."

We are certainly not in love with Mr. Biggar's politics, and we positively loathe MacKean's, but a moral is worth a lot in these days if it only helps to clarify thought, and we hope, for that reason only, that the grey old verteran of Featherstone gets the dull thud.

GOVERNMENT EXPERTS.

The "Manchester Guardian" very effectively riddled the official account of the Punjab troubles, and exposed the pretentious humbug of the officials who were responsible for drawing it up. Instead of the floggings being rare occurrences, and only resorted to on desperate occasions, as we were led to believe at the recent enquiry, it now appears they were perhaps the commonest of all forms of punishments. For the most trivial offences people were whipped. The most astounding thing to the Capitalist newspapers was the one fact we have consistently told the workers ever since

the "Directive Ability" argument was popularised by Mallock. Certain men control industry because they were born, in a way, with the "ability" which the worker lacks. In the same way certain people are born to "govern"—the rich, for example. Even Churchill has quite recently been pointing out that only "experts" like himself ought to be permitted to govern. As a matter of fact these experts do damn-all—underlings do all there is to do, and very often the "expert," in butting-in, upsets everything pretty much, as the mistress who jiggers up the dinner by interfering with the real household genius, called the cook. Mr. Roberts, expert in food control matters, told us he didn't know what a "profiteer" was. Mr. Lloyd George, when he expeted on the land question, made himself a laughing stock by confusing mangel-wurzels with insects.

Now, from this official account of the Amritsar affair, we learn that:—

"The Amritsar affair took place on April 13; it was not till the middle of December that the British public heard that three or four hundred people had been killed and hundreds of others wounded by British troops firing on a crowd which had received no warning to disperse, and Mr. Montagu stated, subsequently, that he had not heard of the slaughter till he read of it in the newspapers."—"Daily News," January 31st.

It only remains to add that Mr. Montagu is an "expert," otherwise, we suppose, he wouldn't be Secretary of State for India.

LENIN AND KAUTSKY.

The magnificent article from the pen of Lenin which scarifies Kautsky, and which is special to the "Worker," is rather a lengthy article for one issue of the "Worker." Our readers, however, will be observant enough to see that such an article ought obviously to appear entire. Lenin answered Kautsky's book on the Proletarian Dictatorship in a book of similar size. Two fragments reached this country. One was printed in the Glasgow "Socialist" three or four weeks ago. The other appears in this issue of the "Worker." The entire work has now reached England, but has not yet been translated. The marvellous dialectical skill of the Marxist scholar, Lenin, is used to the highest advantage in this discussion, and Kautsky's attempt at reconciling irreconcilables is vigorously assailed and totally discredited. We have more original articles in store for our readers, so get on with the sale of the "Worker."

WHEN?

"Nor was there any among them that lacked, for they had all things in common."—"New Testament."

When work has ceased to be a curse,
And fraud and force are pow'rs unknown;
When there is wealth in every purse,
Save his who acts the drone!

When children weep no more for dearth
Of food their parents cannot buy,
But spend sweet babyhood in mirth,
Like birds in summer's sky!

When woman raised from slavery,
In flesh to man and soul to priest,
Is free, and man has ceased to be
A marketable beast!

When "mine" and "thine," and "mass"
and "class,"
Are from the social order thrust—
When all these things have come to pass,
As come to pass they must!

Then, surely then, will dawn the day
By Christ foretold, that He did name
"The Law's fulfilment," and, they say,
For which He died in shame.

* * *

It has not dawned as yet, for Greed,
Ambition, Lust, and love of power,
And every ill such evils breed,
Have stayed the glorious hour.

And still that Law, that Godly aim,
Is jibed and mocked and Judas-kissed,
By men who for their Saviour claim
The master Bolshevist.

Vote for Jim Connolly

Many people will be sorry that a Communist candidate was not put up for Paisley during the present bye-election. The Paisley Branch of the S.L.P. nominated Wm. Paul to stand, as the revolutionary candidate, to oppose the Coalition, Liberal, and Labour candidates.

At a special meeting of Irishmen held at the Paladium in Paisley last Sunday, Comrade Paul stated his reasons for not being able to contest the election. He said he had not refused to stand for Paisley because he was afraid of splitting the Labour vote. The present Labour Party must be opposed tooth and nail, and the Communists of Paisley should make arrangements to place a revolutionary Socialist candidate on the field, to oppose all comers, at the forthcoming General Election. Revolutionary Irishmen had good reasons for fighting Asquith—the man who was directly responsible for the judicial murder of the brilliant Socialist, Jim Connolly. Many Irishmen thought that they could best protest against Connolly's execution by voting for the Labour candidate. They should remember, however, that the Government which foully murdered Connolly had as one of its distinguished members no less a person than the present leader of the Labour Party—Mr. Arthur Henderson. No doubt, said Comrade Paul, some of the Irish Socialists felt that they must use their vote and cast it for some one. Very well, then, let such Socialists, who still looked at the ballot as some sort of magical fetish, let them cast their vote against Henderson's Labour Party and Mr. Asquith by voting for Jim Connolly!

Connolly used to be fond of repeating the statement that it is better to vote for what you want and not get it, than to vote for what you don't want and get it. It was far better to vote for a man like Connolly who dared to die for his principles than to vote for a Labour Party, or an Asquith, which seemed only to live to mislead and deliberately betray the working class in general and revolutionary Socialism in particular.

The meeting was well attended, and was also addressed by Sean M'Loughlin. The greatest enthusiasm prevailed while the speakers made point after point against the three candidates now seeking to mislead the proletariat of Paisley.

LABOUR IN MEXICO.

From a mining camp in Mexico comes the following testimony to the benefits of American Capitalism there. Mexicans work ten hours a day in the mines for twenty centavos a day, equal to 40 cents of American money, or 1/3 a day! There are a large number of unemployed. In these mines there are no safety devices of any kind, and human life is not considered as a factor of loss. This, combined with the spiritlessness of the workers under such conditions, causes about two deaths a month, apart from other accidents. There is a Catholic altar in every mine to comfort the workers in dying!

It is declared that the prime purpose of American intervention in Mexico is to stifle the increasingly bitter protests coming from the Mexican workers. The Communist Party of Mexico is agitating for a general strike in the event of war between the two countries.

★ ★ ★

An Irishman who was going through a churchyard and came across an inscription which read: "Here lies a lawyer and an honest man," and who was heard to exclaim: "How the devil did they get the two of them into the same grave?"

THE WAITRESS'S STRIKE

carters transporting goods to Kerr, then they are working to bring about a victory for

The attraction of the moment is that of a bye-election, the principal figure in which is that decrepit political dug-out, Mr. Henry Herbert Asquith. He is certainly a funny old man. He gets on to the platform and talks like a being from another planet instead of a man in contact with the every-day world. In one of his first speeches in Paisley he talked about Labour being out to establish industrial tyranny. That a certain section of the Labour movement might be used as tools for the perpetuation of the present industrial tyranny is beyond a doubt. But the idea that Labour is out to establish industrial tyranny, when we are actually living in one of the foulest systems of industrial despotism in history, is irresistibly funny.

At the time that Herbert was speaking a waitress's strike was (and is now) being waged in Glasgow. We have had considerable experience of low wages being paid to workers in the past, but the wages that were earned by the girls on strike at the present time are almost unbelievable.

Their kind employer, Mr. Kerr, a "shining light" in the Y.M.C.A., pays them the wage of 12/- per week in 1920. We have always congratulated ourselves on being a brave and a chivalrous people. We firmly believe that we were above all other nations in our respect for womanhood. Our young men were urged during the recent world massacre of the working class to rally and defend our womenfolk from the Huns abroad, and yet we are so mean and contemptible as to allow the health and the morals of our womenfolk to be ruined through the low wages paid them by the restaurant vampires at home. Even before the war, when investigating the cost of living in the City of York, Mr. Beerbohm Rowntree, the cocoa Capitalist, declared that it required 25/- per week to keep a single woman in comfort and decency. And yet we have in 1920, with food prices three times what they were in 1914, 12/- per week being paid as a living wage in the second city of the Empire. Of course the girls get tips. But even with the tips supplementing their wages they are unable to make ends meet.

And the hours of labour they are forced to work are even more damnable than the meagre wages they earn. 12½ hours per day is the normal working day, for 6 days per week. But their kind employer is a Christian, and in a burst of Christian generosity he permits the girls to have the whole of Sunday to themselves in order to go to church and hear how Christianity has civilised the world, and moralised the relations between man and man.

Those conditions are not peculiar to Messrs. Kerr alone. They are typical of the general conditions prevailing throughout the restaurant trade in Glasgow. The only reason Kerr's

workers are on strike before the rest is that Kerr has endeavoured to break the power of the Trade Union that is out to wipe those appalling conditions away. It is always the tactic of employers, in any occupation where Trade Unionism is just getting a foothold, to endeavour to test the workers' loyalty to their organisation by dismissing a few of the more active spirits. Kerr has adopted this tactic, and has sought to terrify the girls (all of them recent recruits to Trade Unionism) by dismissing one of the chief shop stewardesses. The girls have not been frightened, and if the Labour movement is a fighting movement, as well as a talking movement, we can give Kerr the fright of his life. The time has gone past for mouthing phrases about the "solidarity of Labour," and the time for demonstrating the reality of the solidarity we talk about is here and now. The day when any section of the movement could afford to stand by in contemptuous indifference while another section was being strangled by the employers, is surely a thing of the past. The interests of all workers are bound up closely together. The conditions of labour prevailing in one particular occupation react upon the conditions prevailing in all other occupations, and for the strong sections of the movement to stand by and allow a weak section to be beaten is not only an act of disgusting cowardice and treachery, but is also an act calculated to undermine their own position as workers.

The saddest thing about the strike is not the greed of the employers (for greed is the badge of their tribe), but the shameless apathy that is manifest in the ranks of the Trade Unionists. Here we have women fighting a brave fight against detestable conditions of sweating.

The employer is endeavouring to carry on, and he can only carry on with the assistance of Trade Union labour. He has an extensive sale of cakes and sweetmeats. We shall be glad to hear to the contrary, but we are informed from a credible source that those dainties are the product of Trade Union labour. If this is so, then we consider that those workers are more culpable than Kerr & Co. They are deliberately buttressing the most damnable form of sweating. Surely those men can cast their eyes outside the narrow circle of their trade interests for one moment, and do a generous manly action for once, by refusing to manufacture any cakes or sweetmeats for this firm of slave drivers. If they refuse to do so, then it is time that their action should be described to them in plain language. By working for Kerr & Co., they are standing behind the standard-bearers of sweating in Glasgow, and are actively helping those people to impose degrading conditions on defenceless members of the working class.

The same applies to any other Union who are helping Kerr in any way. If there are any

sweated labour. If there are electricians supplying electricity, then they have to share the responsibility of helping sweating, too.

The trouble at the present moment is that there are too many people flitting in the limelight of the Paisley bye-election, and too few assisting in the industrial fight here in Glasgow.

By the by, what are the Trades Council doing. Their attempt to negotiate with the employers has proved a failure. Can they not carry the fight further? They are the foremost industrial body in the city on the official side. Could they not take the responsibility of calling a meeting of the other unions concerned, and endeavour to get them to take concerted action to defeat Kerr. If they do not rise to the occasion, then the unofficial bodies in the city will have to step in and carry on the fight. To allow these girls to be beaten will be to disgrace the Labour movement in Glasgow.

Are we so weak and so contemptible as to allow a small pack of sweaters to hold the movement in Glasgow up to derision and contempt? Are we only a hot-air association, or are we a determined fighting body?

This strike is going to be a test as to whether we are serious or not.

Now, a word to the rank and file. Every Sunday thousands of Socialists attend meetings in Glasgow to cheer the message of Socialism. If those Socialists are sincere, then they have a bounden duty to wage the class struggle in whatever form it manifests itself. It is true that this strike is only a small skirmish in the class war. But it is just as important for the Labour movement to win its skirmishes as it is to win its large scale battles. Our whole weight must be thrown in the scale on the side of the workers on every possible occasion. In what way can the rank and file help?

1. It can help by assisting the mass pickets who assemble outside the restaurants. Crowds of people are wanted to assemble outside the restaurants, particularly the Carlton in St. Vincent Street, and the Regent in West Regent Street, and help to make things uncomfortable for the creatures who are still frequenting those places. A few dozen people are in the habit of turning up and helping the pickets, but a few dozen people are not enough, we want the assistance of hundreds of active Socialists for this work.

2. The rank and file can also help by getting authority from the Women's Federation, 135 Wellington Street, to take collections from their workmates.

3. They can work within their unions (bakers, electricians, and carters particularly) to stimulate their official bodies into action.

4. They can stand by to respond to the call for unofficial action. By doing these things they can help to take the first line of sweating system in Glasgow, and make it clear that no employer can attack any section of the working class without bringing the resources of the whole Labour movement to the side of the section who are being attacked.

J. R. C.

CIVILISATION

By W. M'Laine.

"To be civilised," says the dictionary, "is to be reclaimed from savage life, to be instructed in the rules and customs of regular life," and civilisation is described as, "the state of being civilised."

There is a certain smug complacency about the word "reclaimed" in this connection. It suggests the elevation and the education of some poor benighted people who have never known the blessings that education and art and science can bring to them. It suggests the instruction of people in the laws of social life, and the inculcation of a nobler conception of such things as duty towards one's fellows in society.

However, "things are not what they seem," as it says in the hymn books. A recent number of the "Colonial Journal" gave our faith in civilisation a rude shock when it said:—

"A Gold Coast Committee has reported that the question of compassionate allowances for

the dependants of deceased native officials cannot be dealt with on the same lines as it is dealt with in the case of Europeans. Native tribal and family systems are a great bulwark against destitution and extreme poverty, such as may be the unfortunate lot of a widow and children in a highly civilised community, on the death of the breadwinner."

There does not seem to be very much to write home about in our modern society if it cannot come up to the standard of Native tribal systems in the matter of providing some kind of a decent life for its unfortunate members. True, we have our workhouses, and our pensions, and our charitable institutions—all products of our civilised state, but they can hardly be called "a great bulwark against destitution and extreme poverty."

But, of course, civilisation has some things to its credit. We do not go about with a club in our hands in order to enforce our arguments. Oh no. We merely persuade people by the logic of our sweet reasonableness. We are now so highly developed socially that we can afford to look down from our

lofty heights upon the poor miserable wretches who are not as good as we are. We no longer howl and make guttural noises when we are displeased—in fact, we are civilised.

Still, there seems to be some doubt about even this. Raymond A. Coulson, writing in the "Sunday Chronicle" for 25th January, has something to say about the crime wave that is exciting the attention of everyone just now. He wishes to find an explanation for the numerous atrocities that are taking place in England—the hold-ups, the outrages, the murders, and all the rest of those things that are carefully kept out of the Continental Press for fear the Bolsheviks should get to know how stable and law abiding we have become.

Coulson thinks that the army training has had something to do with it all. He says:—

"The early bayonet fighting courses were pretty mild, but after two or three years they became performances that would have stirred the blood of a cinema film producer."

Writing of the methods adopted to turn out efficient bayonet handlers he describes how the instructors elevated the recruits:—

"Howl, damn yer, howl! Grit your teeth and grunt when you stick your bayonet in. Into his stomach. Right in! Now get on! Oh get on! Get on!"

"The voice would rise to an inarticulate yell, and with howls and glaring eyes the class would go whirling ahead to the next row of dummies.

"I have assisted in training Pathaus, Gurkas, and Baluchis in this pretty art. All three are accounted fairly ferocious by nature. But we taught them something. And for all their dark skins and rolling eyes, and flowing hair, they never put up a show to equal that of a squad of "gently nurtured English officers."

Well, "civilisation" had a good turn. So far it has only produced howling dervishes, whose superior education and reprimand can make them outdo the "savage" tribes in the matter of Bactui ferocity.

Starvation for its unfortunate elements, and an expert training in the act of murder is not a very good recommendation for a social system that boasts of its superiority over all other forms. No wonder the "backward" races are wakening up and are refusing to acknowledge that the white races are really so very superior after all.

All our culture, all our science, all our education, has so far been of little avail. The reason is because the common people, the workers, have not come into their own, but allow all the benefits made possible by their toil to be used to exploit themselves and other people of a like status in all parts of the world.

There can be no Civilisation under Capitalism.

BOOK REVIEWS.

"The Class Struggle," by Jack London (Mills & Boons, 2/-).

"The Acorn Planter," by Jack London (Mills & Boons, 3/6).

Messrs. Bills & Boon have just issued a cheap reprint of Jack London's "War of the Classes." The book has previously circulated in Britain, either in a library edition, or in expensive American editions. It is now available at a price suitable for propaganda purpose, and it is excellent propaganda. The "War of the Classes" is destined to figure alongside the "Iron Heel" and the "People of the Abyss" as one of the best of London's books dealing with Socialism. Every chapter is full of interesting matter, though those on "the Scab," the "Law of Development," and "How I became a Socialist," are particularly good.

The other book, "The Acorn Planter," is different from anything else that London ever wrote. It is described as a "California forest play," planned to be sung by efficient singers, accompanied by a capable chorus. It appears to be an allegorical attack on Capitalism and Militarism. London has drawn upon old Indian myths and legends to enrich the play. Of its merits as a play we cannot offer an opinion, but it is certainly very interesting reading.

C. J. R.

National Union of Police and Prison Officers

The Truth about the Police Strike.

Have you heard it? Send for one of our speakers to address your Branch and so help us to defeat the Coalition Government.

Twenty-three weeks on strike for a Trade Union principle!

Address your request to

WM. B. SMITHWICK, Organiser,
21 Islington, Liverpool.

SHOP STEWARD SYSTEM IN AMERICA.

The purpose of the Shop Steward System is to allow for complete autonomy in affairs which are purely the concern of the individual Yard or Shop, in respect to the different departments that are engaged in the shipbuilding industry.

Grievances that are jurisdictional, etc., are taken up and settled as soon as possible by Shop Committees on the job, thereby eliminating all the red-tape and waste of time that the present system requires, doing away with the unnecessary friction that now occurs between employer and employee.

The System gives each and every member a voice, not only in the nomination and election of their Shop Stewards in their particular group, but also in every individual grievance of the members of the group, thereby having a system whereby any member who has a grievance knows to whom to present it, for instance: a riveter having a grievance will go to one of the **Five Stewards of his Group**. The Steward will take the grievance to the Chairman of the Group, who in turn will take the matter up with the Foreman for adjustment, and failing to reach a settlement, the Chairman of the Group having the grievance will take the case up with the **Chairman of the entire fourteen (14) Groups**, who will thoroughly investigate the case, and in the event that their findings are in favour of the worker having the grievance, they will immediately demand a settlement from the management, through the Executive Council of five acting in the particular yard involved. The latter body shall have a Chairman who will, together with the Chairman of the Group having the grievance and the party or parties directly involved, take the matter up with the management for adjustment. The Chairman of the Executive Council shall at all times be under the instructions of the Executive Body. Should the Executive Council fail to reach a settlement with the management, the case shall be referred to the Metal Trades Council for final action.

Members of the Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, Local 104, are assembled into fourteen Groups as follows:—

GROUPS.

1. Boiler Makers, Boiler Makers' Helpers on installation, etc., outside—3 Stewards.
2. Boiler Makers working in Boiler Shops, their Helpers and all men working in Boiler Shops under the jurisdiction of Local 104—3 Stewards.
3. Riveters, Holder-on, Heaters, and Passer Boys—5 Stewards.
4. Chippers and Caulkers and all men working in Test Gangs, including Helpers, Rivet Testers and Water Tenders—5 Stewards.
5. Acetylene Burners, Welders, and Electrical Welders and their Helpers—5 Stewards.
6. Bolter-ups on Hulls and in Yards—10 Stewards.
7. Punch and Shearmen, Planermen, Scarfers, Counter Sinkers, and their Helpers and all men working under the jurisdiction of Local 104, in the Plate Shop—3 Stewards.
8. General Helpers working under the jurisdiction of Local 104 and men employed to re-thread bolts and re-tap nuts and all men employed at such work under the jurisdiction of Local 104 at which only a few men are employed—3 Stewards.
9. All Ship Fitters and their Helpers, and all men employed in the Mold Loft and their Helpers—5 Stewards.
10. Plate Hangers and their Helpers, Hook Tenders, Signalmen and Crane Chasers—5 Stewards.
11. All Riggers and their Helpers on Hulls and in Yards—3 Stewards.
12. Slabmen and their Helpers—3 Stewards.
13. All Drillers, Tappers, Reamers, and their Helpers—5 Stewards.
14. All men employed in the tool room, including hose men and forge repairers—3 Stewards.

All workers in the respective yards and shops are represented as shown above.

The Stewards of each particular Group will elect a Chairman for that particular Group. All Stewards in their respective Yard or Shop

will elect Five of their number, who shall be known as the Executive Council. This Executive Council shall elect a Chairman, who will act as Spokesman for that body, but will always be under the instructions of a majority of the Executive Council.

Note.—This Summary is but a rough outline of the Shop Steward System, and will be followed immediately by a booklet explaining thoroughly the entire system, which will be illustrated by a Chart.

Correspondence

A PAISLEY DEMONSTRATION.

38 Clark Street,
Paisley,
Monday, Jan. 26th.

(To the Editor of the "Worker.")

Sir,—Having attended the Hands Off Russia Demonstration in the Town Hall, Paisley, on Thursday last, January 22nd, I wish to express—through the columns of the "Worker"—my disapprobation of the conduct and methods of one of the speakers at the Demonstration.

Dr. Esterman, being called upon to second the resolution, said it was peculiarly appropriate for him to second the resolution, as being a Russian himself—his mother and father both having been born in Russia—he was therefore able to speak with some knowledge of the conditions that had prevailed with the proletariat there under the Czarist regime.

Now, the most exacting critic could not find anything boastful, or self-laudatory, in any part of Dr. Esterman's discourse that night. But Maxton, on rising to support the resolution, made it plain that he considered Dr. Esterman was unduly elated about his Russian parentage; continuing, Maxton treated us to an eulogistic narration of his illustrious—if humble—revolutionary ancestors. And yet he inferred it was ostentatious of Dr. Esterman to speak of his parents.

But the thunder-bolt had fallen, when Dr. Esterman said he would take the opportunity there of crossing swords with the Labour Party—the prospective Labour Candidate for Paisley being on the platform—and how well he exposed the ramifications of those pseudo-Socialists was very evident by the frenzied vituperation of Maxton. The attitude of Dr. Esterman throughout was one of dignified modesty, yet how he thrilled the class-conscious worker with real revolutionary and constructive argument. What a contrast Maxton was, with his personal jibes and sneers, his serio-comic tragedian-like acting, his egotistical adulation; and, above all, his admonition to canny Scots. Their temperament he said—in effect—would not allow them, to do anything so rash as defend themselves with guns, bayonets and bombs—if need be—against the Capitalists. No! he said, we will advance with careful steps up to their front line trenches and beat them to death with ballot boxes.

It is sad to think that one whose intentions may be of the best should be so perverse, and continue to avow his adherence to the same band of yellow internationalists as have been responsible in Germany for the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht.

Yours for the Revolution,

"RED GUARD."

201 Buchanan Street,
Glasgow, 30th Jan., 1920.

(To the Editor of the "Worker.")

Dear Sir,—There are no greater aids to understanding many of the seemingly inexplicable phenomena of society than a keen sense of humour and a sound knowledge of the "Materialistic Conception of History." I judge from his choice of a non-de-plume that your correspondent, "Red Guard," possesses both.

I ask him to reconsider the whole matter bringing these aids to bear, and I am quite sure he will see his way to modify his somewhat harsh criticisms of myself.

Yours fraternally,

JAS. MAXTON.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF EX-SERVICE MEN

EX-SERVICE MEN.

N.E.C. meeting held in I.L.P. Rooms, 686 Argyle Street. Good reports were tendered by the delegates of the various branches. Final arrangements were completed for Congress, which takes place on Saturday first, the 7th of February. It was agreed to take the I.L.P. Rooms as our temporary headquarters. The Rooms will be open from 10 till 4 daily. The postal address will be as usual, 118 Holm Street, Glasgow. A committee was appointed to draft resolutions for the press, same to be submitted to Congress. Encouraging letters were read from Bristol, London, Darvel, and Bowhill.

We have been repeatedly asked, seeing that the National Union claims to have an advanced policy, and both organisations seem to have the same objects in view, why did the International Union not take steps to secure amalgamation, close up the ranks of the workers, and present a united front to the common enemy? The argument seems good on paper, but those who put forward that argument do not seem to be aware that attempts to amalgamate have been made, but the attempts were failures. Our National Organiser and the late National Secretary got in touch with the National with a view of coming to a working agreement, but in my opinion, and in the opinion of the members of our Organisation, the following letter closed the door:—

National Union of Ex-Service Men.

President—Duncan Carmichael.

General Secretary—A. E. Mander.

Organising Headquarters,
Labour Hall,
The Hill,
Ilford,
19-6-19.

Comrade,

Thanks very much letter of the 18th inst. I have already been in communication with the Editor of your organ, the "New World." Personally, I agree with you that it ought to be possible for us who are fighting for the same cause to unite, so that we can show a combined front, but I cannot commit my N.O.C. to anything until I have consulted them on the subject.

I have read your Constitution with interest. There does not seem to be much difference between your organisation and this one, as you will realise on perusing the copy of our provisional constitution and statement of Aims and Policy, which I enclose.

There are, however, one or two points which we might discuss before opening any definite negotiations on behalf of our respective E.C.

(1) Your reference to the RED FLAG. Well, whatever the personal views of the members of our Executive may be, we feel it would be bad policy for us to talk too much about the Red Flag in England just now. Of course it may be different in Scotland; but here we are making an appeal to all Trades Unionists—and some of them, as you are aware, are rather timid, and are apt to condemn any reference to the Red Flag and to fight shy of any organisation which openly adopts it. In certain parts of England the Red Flag is not recognised as the standard of organised Labour, but only as the Banner of Revolution by violence. And . . . well, we want to get them all in whether they believe that the Social Revolution and the emancipation of the worker can be obtained by constitutional means, or whether they despair of such methods and feel that force is the only remedy.

(2) Unity is a very good thing. I believe in Unity when it is in a good cause, but there is such a thing as paying too dear a price. We are prepared for Unity at any time, providing it will further the principles we hold dear, but we are not prepared to sell these principles for all the Unity in the world.

As the subject of Amalgamation has again cropped up, our readers will remember that a few weeks ago I stated that there was a move on to unite the advanced Ex-Service Men's Organisations into one body. That move is now at an end, personalities crept in and wrecked the scheme, but the International Union is not worrying. We admit we are not the strongest organisation numerically or financially, but we do claim to be the only organisation with a definite object in view. The only organisation that does not attempt to camouflage the workers. We hide nothing, for we have nothing to hide. The Aims and Policy, as stated in our Constitution, represent our views indoors and out-doors.

Several branches have been writing re the Canteen Fund. I am pleased to state that the Union has secured representation on the Committee in Glasgow. Several other districts have been refused representation, notably Paisley, but the brass hats need not think we are taking the rebuff lying down. We are going to have representation on all committees, whether they like it or not.

BRANCH REPORTS.

Anderston and Central.—Usual weekly meeting held on Friday night. An interesting discussion took place on the best way to remedy the grievances of the disabled men, widows, and dependants. All the speakers agreed that under a Capitalist system of government it was impossible for the under dog to secure justice. The only solution was to work for the overthrow of the present system, and establish a sane system of society, where all men and women who through disability or illness are unable to work will be provided for. Children the State's first duty, and no orphans be tainted with charity. Three new members were enrolled.

Bridgeton.—Fortnightly meeting held in the I.L.P. Rooms, Canning Street. There was a record attendance. The agenda for Congress was discussed in detail, and delegates instructed how to vote. Comrades Burke and Miller were appointed to represent the branch. The National Organiser was present, and addressed the members. A resolution was moved, seconded, and carried, demanding the withdrawal of all troops from Ireland.

St. Rollox.—Owing to a misunderstanding there was no meeting last Thursday. Next meeting will be a summoned one; by this time the branch will have been re-organised. It is intended to secure a more suitable meeting place nearer the main thoroughfare.

South Side.—The first meeting of the branch was held on Monday, 26th January, at 19 Morrison Street, S.S. The National Organiser opened the branch with a characteristic speech, in which he traced the history of the Union since its inception, and concluded with a vigorous denunciation of Capitalism and Militarism, and a plea to ex-Service men to line up in the ranks of the Social Revolution. Comrades Cox and Burke also addressed the meeting, and gave very valuable advice regarding organisation and propaganda. 10 new members joined up. All South Side ex-Service men, who want to belong to an organisation with a "punch," should call or write to the Branch Secretary, J. Wardle, 65 Dale Street, S.S.

Maryhill.—Usual weekly meeting was held in the I.L.P. Rooms, Wyndford Street. Good turn out of members, and everything going strong. The following resolutions were ordered to be sent on to be submitted to Congress: That we, the International Union of Ex-Service Men, widows and adult dependants, strongly object to further intervention by the Government in Russia, and call upon them to withdraw all British troops, and to at once remove the blockade and allow the Russian people to be master of their own destinies. Further, we also demand the withdrawal of British Troops from Ireland. In the stormy days of warfare we were told that we were fighting for self-determination. If that be so, what the Hell are we doing in Ireland, Russia, India, and Egypt? The freedom of nations be hanged. We were not fighting for the freedom of nations. What we were fighting for was the enthronement of the Capitalist and the degradation of the workers, and we have succeeded. Dance Committee reported all well. Date of dance will be inserted in next issue.

Clydebank.—At a special meeting held on Wednesday night it was decided to change place of meeting. The branch now meets in M'Kim's Restaurant, 103 Glasgow Road, every Thursday night at 7.30. In connection with propaganda meeting to be held in the Co-operative Hall on February 26th, the Secretary intimated that the following speakers have been secured:—Councillor Kirkwood, Comrade J. R. Campbell, or J. V. Leckie, and our National Organiser. Dance Committee reported that they have been successful in securing a hall. Further announcements re date and price of tickets will be intimated at a later date.

Paisley.—Usual weekly meeting held on Friday last. Correspondence re representation on Canteen Fund was read. It was agreed to send same on to the National Secretary to deal with. The members then discussed the Bye-Election, but it was decided not to come to any decision until Headquarters had been communicated with.

Darvel.—Usual weekly meeting held on Sunday. The question of representation on the L.W.P.C. was gone into; it was intimated that we were sure of representation on the County Committee, and we were determined to be represented on the Area Committee also. With that object in view it was decided to call a special meeting of all ex-Service men, widows, and dependants, and have a ballot vote to decide who will be the representative on the L.W.P.C. Area Committee. Comrade T. McClymont was nominated to oppose the gentleman who at present mis-represents the ex-Service men on the Committee. A special meeting was held on Monday night, and it was agreed to have a Lecture, Concert and Dance on Friday, February the 7th. The National Organiser is the speaker, and the subject is Bolshevism. Comrades Donaldson and McClymont were elected delegates to Congress.

London.—Organisation still going strong. Com. W. A. A. Painter is working steadily away on behalf of the International Union. Prospects are brighter than a week ago, as several ex-Service men in the London area have volunteered to assist in organising. Developments will be announced later.

There is no reports to hand this week from Bristol, Milngavie, Bowhill, Airdrie, Western, and Kilbirnie.

JAS. COX, Nat. Secy.

THE PROLETARIAN SCHOOL

Lectures every Sunday

IN THE

PANOPTICON, 115 Trongate

Sunday, 8th February, at 6.30

J. R. CAMPBELL

on "TACTICS."

Soloist - - - - ALICE BARTLETT
Reader - - - - AGNES HODGE

Doors Open at 6 p.m.

Songs. Questions. Discussions.
Silver Collection.

The Story of Robert Burns

By John S. Clarke

A wonderfully condensed summary of the career and work of Scotland's peasant and genius.

Splendid Propaganda—Now on Sale.

Price Threepence. 2/6 per doz. of 13.

Published by Scottish Workers' Committees.

Clydebank Branch of the Socialist Labour Party.

Under the auspices of above Branch

A GRAND LECTURE

Will be given in the

CO-OPERATIVE HALL, Hume Street,

Sunday, 8th February

Doors open 6.15 - Chair at 7 prompt

Comrade D. A. KENNEDY

Subject—"Evolution of the Mind."

Admission by Silver Collection.

Questions. Discussion

Sunday, 15th February - Com. Fitzpatrick

ANDERSTON BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY

"Seek knowledge, not shallow Rhetoric"

The following Speakers "deliver the goods" in

B.S.P. HALL, 569 Argyle Street, at 6-30

Sunday 8th—Jack V. Leckie

„ 15th—Wm. McLaine

„ 22nd—Rose Witcop, Editor of "Spur"

„ 29th—Wm. Gallacher

Read

The February Number of

"DATA."

Articles on

M.P.'s in the Pillory, "The Human Machine," The Economics of the Irish Question, The Coming Revolution, Court-Martials during the Great War, Reviews, &c., &c.

A Grand Number,

Price Twopence; Post Free, 2½d.,

From the Socialist Information and Research Bureau (Scotland), 196 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow.

Finding a lady reading "Twelfth Night," a facetious doctor asked: "When Shakespeare wrote about 'Patience on a monument' did he mean doctors' patients?" "No," said the lady, "you find them under monuments, not on them."

"The circulation of the blood was invented by Martin Harvey."

Printed by Kirkwood & Co., 127 Stockwell Street, and Published by J. Messer, 9 Leyden St., Maryhill, Glasgow, for Scottish Workers' Committees.