

KNOWLEDGE MUST PRECEDE ALL INTELLIGENT ACTION

THE WORKER

ORGANISE

EDUCATE

THE ORGAN OF WORKERS' COMMITTEES SCOTLAND

THE REVOLUTIONARY JOURNAL WITH THE LARGEST CIRCULATION IN BRITAIN.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

Edited by JOHN S. CLARKE.

No. 114.

29th JANUARY, 1921

Price 2d.

Pepper and Salt.

Under the picture of Lady Lillian Maxwell Wiltshire, sent out by a press bureau, is a caption announcing that she has gone to work. If everything goes well in the next few years, this sort of thing will excite no comment.

There is much outcry because of the fact that some members of society are taking valuables from other people by force and strategy. This is called a crime wave. We wonder how the robbery of the working class is classified. Some people that we know call it business. We are inclined to think that it is the greatest crime that was ever committed against humanity. It is the original "sin."

"The crime wave," isn't it identical with the wave of capitalist-imperialism that is now ruining the world?

The living wage invariably consists in the minimum at which any worker is willing to exist. So, if you are patriotic and never eat chicken, and you buy everything cheap and preferably second-hand, or are satisfied that something somebody else has used first is good enough for you, and the boss pays you enough cash to live down to these conceptions, then you are getting what both he and you consider a living wage.

Them prophets who were tellin' eight months ago that all we needed wuz more production ain't makin' a lot of noise explainin' these days.

"Economic exploitation is made possible by, and is protected by the machinery of political government, which came into being only when private property required protection."

M. Clemenceau, greeting at the Peace Conference Paderewski, Prime Minister of Poland, looked curiously at the great virtuoso in his new role. "Vous etes le fameux pianiste?" ("You are the famous pianist?"), the Frenchman inquired. Paderewski bowed. Clemenceau regarded him gravely. "Quelle chute!" ("What a come down in the world!") he murmured.—Major Lindsay Bashford, in "Blackwoods."

At the factory the capitalist is monarch of all he surveys. He is obeyed by all, and his directions are implicitly carried out. The factory is extended or reduced at his will. At his command, through foremen and managers, workmen are employed or dismissed. He decides how long they are to work and what pay they are to get. And all this happens because the factory is his factory, the works his works—they belong to him, are his private property. It is this right of private property over the means of production that is the cause of the terrible power which is in the hands of capital.

As an old workman I am sick and ashamed of the ca-canny methods, which are, to my knowledge, so widely prevalent; they are not only detrimental in the long run to the workmen's economic interest, but they are also degrading to their humanity. I am sick and ashamed of the leaders who encourage ca-canny methods under the false pretence that there is a deliberate plot by employers to cut wages.—Mr G. N. Barnes, M.P.

EVERY WORKER INTERESTED IN THE LABOUR AND SOCIALIST MOVEMENT should purchase a copy of the

SCOTTISH LABOUR DIARY FOR 1921.

Contains 142 pages of useful information, in addition to usual diary pages. £1,000 Insurance Coupon. Nicely bound in leather and of handy size for the vest pocket.

Price 2/6, post free.

REFORMERS' BOOKSTALL, LTD.,
—224 Buchanan Street, Glasgow.—



—“Liberator.”

Rafferty, Lafferty and O-bri-en,
To all the King's horses and all the King's men.

A JOURNEY THROUGH BOLSHEVIKI LAND.

XIV.—'Know Then Thyself.'

By JOHN S. CLARKE.

"Of all the causes which conspire to blind
Man's erring judgment, and misguide the mind:
What the weak head with strongest bias rules,
Is Pride—the never failing vice of fools."

—Alexander Pope.

Then Comrades come rally! the last fight let us
face,

The International alone unites the human race.

I have no intention to weary my readers with an exhaustive description of the luxuriantly gaudy hall and its apartments which were devoted to the use of delegates in the Tsar's Great Palace of the Kremlin. The mosaic floors and tapestried walls; the rich Italian candelabras and gilded columns; the gorgeously jewel-studded and mother-of-pearl inlaid doors and furnishings—all spoke eloquently of the utter wickedness of a social system which bestowed such privileges upon the sickliest, and most stupid creatures on earth (Monarchs), while their mental, moral, and physical superiors were either languishing in prison cells or living in penury in exile.

An old attendant wandered about to perform any little service required of him, though he was very seldom called upon. He had been a lacquey at the Kremlin for a great many years, an attendant of Tsar Nicholas II., whom he always spoke of as "imperator," and appeared to be just as much "at home" under the new conditions as ever. It would have been interesting indeed to have had the power, now and again, of fathoming the old man's thoughts, for familiarity with unaccustomed splendour soon provoked the inevitable contempt on the part of many of the visitors. Not that they weren't scrupulously careful—no courtiers could have been more so. The Bolsheviks had piously protected the "property of the people" by covering the beautiful golden thrones with scarlet cloth, but this did not prevent us from sitting upon them. Pershkovsky and I were sitting on the dias one day with our heads reclining on the plush of the throne, when the incongruity of everything suddenly occurred to me. Vladimir, after whom the Hall is named, lived in the 10th century, little short of one thousand years ago, and we were watching typists clicking away at their machines and listening to telephone bells ringing. Serrati from Italy came up and begged a match for his cigarette, or to be nearer the mark, his alleged cigarette. He is what they call a "dapper" individual, very smartly attired, with trim beard, and he wears a gold ring. He is always suave, polished, and affable, but he doesn't like Bolshevism. His friend D'Arragona was more slovenly in appearance, wore a long streaming beard, and carried a sarcastic tongue. He is of a rather despicable type. His signature adorned the first Manifesto calling for the Red International of Trade and Industrial Unions, but as soon as he reached Italy his opportunist-menshevik character reasserted itself, and he repudiated the position he stood for in Moscow. A totally different type of Italian is Bordiga. A very thick-set, swarthy son of the south, who, with Bombacci, brought most of the revolutionary spirit contributed by Italy.

Other figures pass along the reception room in which we "at ease recline." Lenin pops in occasionally and vanishes through a mysterious door in the next room. Big Levy from Germany, a disciple of Rosa Luxembourg, sits at a table making notes. The flaming sun enters the windows and plays upon the ornamental decanters containing—water, disinfected water, in front of him. There is a hum of voices in the Congress Hall, a titter of laughter in a corner of the smoke room, an incessant and monotonous click of typewriters in the reception room, a rattle of spoons and glasses in the refreshment room, but Levy goes steadily on with his work. Suddenly he lifts

his head and half wheeling in the chair glances over his shoulder. He is not the only one who looks mystified. Radek is craning his neck in order to peep over the rims of his big spectacles; several typewriters cease fire, and everyone looks amused except Dittman, as a droll voice bellows out from a Scotch stomach:

"Hoo the hell can I wurrk when there's nae wurrk to do?

Hallelujah! Gie's a haund up,

For Christ's sake, Amen!"

To detail every conversation I had with every interesting being I met in Moscow would require a volume in itself and would only appeal to the type of mind which delights in gossip. One remark I passed to Lenin, however, has become historic—that the "British Communist movement was a joke." How it became common property in this country I do not know, but it got here, to the satisfaction of some and the irritation of others. It is a fact that too many British Communists have attempted to inveigle the movement into slavishly copying Russian tactics, without regard to the totally different conditions obtaining in the several countries. In an article I wrote on my return I pointed out this tremendous difference, and ventured to characterise Russia as "politically infantile" and "industrially loosely organised." For this, I was roundly abused by one group of zealots who evidently considered such a characterisation to be little short of lese majeste.

Three weeks afterward this same section pub-

THE PRESIDIUM.



Zinovieff.

Lenin.

Serrati.

Balabanova.

And round a corner comes an apparition dressed in a blouse of the latest cut, but originally intended for a body twice the size of its present wearer's. The neck collar is open and the sleeves rolled up to the elbows, but my companion, for it is a he, is quite happy.

Pershkovsky leans towards me and whispers: "Come over and I'll introduce you to a remarkably fine woman comrade." A tall dignified-looking woman had entered the room, and stood looking into the courtyard from the open window. Very tall, with almost pure silver-hued hair, she was attired in a plain costume of grey gaberdine and a very commonplace hat. He walked over and I was introduced to Madam Kroupsky, the clever wife of Oulianoff. Her affairs are almost entirely educational, and she, together with Lunacharsky, has effected some wonderful improvements in the educational system of Soviet Russia. My photograph of her was taken a long time ago, and gives no indication whatever of the character which is now stamped upon her features. The lines of heavy trouble, anxiety, and responsibility, which lie upon the face of the original, are entirely lacking in the photograph. None of the prominent women of Russia like to be photographed. They leave this so-called feminine trait to the men folk who are continually being "snapped" by admirers. It must bore them occasionally, but their good-nature is such that no one is refused a "sitting." Lenin does not mind it at all, and I have some snapshots which are delightfully unconventional and which lesser men would have tried to have destroyed.

Kroupskaya speaks with a very sympathetic and rich-toned voice and has a very sad smile. She took ill on the evening of this very day and did not venture out of her own apartments again until after the Congress was over. She is now in perfect health again.

lished a pamphlet written by Comrade Kameniev of the Moscow Soviet, called "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat," in which the illuminating passage occurs:—

"The actual Russian bourgeoisie always was, and up to the October Revolution remained, the least organised, the least conscious in the sense of class, the least united of all bourgeois classes in the countries of the old capitalist order. The Russian peasantry had not time enough to develop that class of strong and politically-united peasants, which is the basis of a series of bourgeois parties in the West. The Russian middle class of the towns, crushed and politically unenlightened, never represented anything like such groups of the population as, in the West, create and support the parties of "Christian Socialism" and anti-Semitism.

"The first thunder claps of the proletarian revolution broke over this politically backward, inactive and unorganised class. The resistance of the exploiters' to the blows of the Russian proletariat must therefore be considered as comparatively weak—weak, naturally only in comparison with the activity which the bourgeoisie of any other European country will be able to develop."

Here we have not "politically infantile" but "politically unenlightened," as well as "least organised," "least united," "least class-conscious," "politically backward," "inactive," and "unorganised" all in the one short paragraph, and all of which are perfectly true.

Most of the active Bolsheviks have travelled the world somewhat, they are all Marxists, they applied their Marxist knowledge to the study of conditions in other countries, and concentrated on Russia because they knew—comparatively

speaking—that the overthrow of the bourgeoisie was going to be an easy job. Why? Simply because Russia was absolutely “politically infantile.” The Duma, an institution presented by the Tsar, was notoriously never anything more than a literary debating society. Autocracy ruled with an iron hand. Autocracy could dispose of the Duma whenever it thought fit, and did so. Autocracy controlled every political avenue in the country. There never had been a “parliament” in which active legislation had been carried through. And even the poor filleted Tsarist pretence of a Constitution only dates back to 1906. The result of it all was that the benighted bourgeoisie of Russia were always so enfeebled that “unity” wouldn’t have done much for them. Their “concessions” and “permits,” indeed their very existence as manufacturers or merchants, depended not on their political strength or prestige, but on their ability to bribe some functionary who would in turn bribe someone else who knew Rasputin, or some other court rascal, who finally pulled the autocratic wires on their behalf. There is not one history of Russia that says otherwise.

The second aspect of this is that the bourgeoisie of Russia never cultivated the art or science of politics, because such would have been useless to them—they not having the opportunity to participate in political action. They never, therefore, developed a class-conscious breed of politician such as the British or French bourgeoisie did, hence their pitiable political impotence when their chance came at the moment of autocracy’s collapse. Contrast Milinkoff, for instance, with Bonar Law; Kerensky with Lloyd George or Clemenceau; Terestchenko with Winston Churchill or Asquith. Why, the meanest figure that sits in the British House of Commons is a more astute vote-getter and trickster than any of the above-named Russian politicians. How easy (comparatively) it was for the fighting Marxians, who understood all these things to begin with, to blow the bourgeois rubbish out of the way! Are we going to have so easy a job? Will prating about Marxism help us? Has our economic system collapsed owing to the great war? Is our population—the majority of it—literally starving? Finally, have we bred the right kind of rebel? Answer these questions, my Communist comrades, then get to work.

First of all, don’t depend on some nebulous automatic collapse of Capitalism to prepare the arena for you. Even supposing such a collapse as occurred in Russia (1916-17) did occur here—where are our exiled Lenins, Trotskys, Zinovieffs and the other one hundred thousand revolutionary exiles, such as swarmed into Mother Russia whom they loved, when the storm broke? Conditions in this country never bred such. Six months in the second division is very annoying, but it is not calculated to breed the type of rebel that is bred by fifteen years in chains in dreary Siberia or hideous Schlussemburg. Life is very dear to the Britisher—it is of positive insignificance to a Russian. Mouth away about Internationalism but Race still counts for a lot, and Race is largely the product of conditions—climatic, geographic, historic, sociologic, and economic.

As I write this there is every prospect of a United Communist Party being formed in the near future. Let us hope it will apply itself to the task of building up a fighting organisation fitted to function under conditions which are peculiar to its own country. As a part of the Third International—the necessary core of the World Revolutionary movement—that will be the justification and sole justification for its existence. We have the most cunning, most powerful and most politically and economically wide-awake ruling class on earth to combat. We have a proletariat as different to the Russian proletariat as chalk differs from cheese. Our proletariat can read and write, they are doped and have been doped for centuries; they are cursed with traditional ideas of freedom and superiority; they have to be uneducated. Our insularity, our dependence on other countries, and the relatively well-entrenched power of our Menshevik opponents and trade union bureaucracy, are other factors to consider.

Our Communist Party must get down to calm consideration of every aspect of political and social life in this country. Ideas imported from Russia must be modified to suit the changed conditions. This is the scientific way of looking at it. Any other way is but the product of sheer emotionalism or vapid enthusiasm making for disaster. That splendid thinker Georg Brandes once wrote:—

“Nobody knows what the future carries in her womb. Yet we know that what is expedient for one country will not do for another. Every country has its past, its social differences, its special culture. Never yet has any idea gone from one country to another without being transformed to suit the needs of that country. Even the parliamentary idea, at one time very strong, was taken up very slowly and adapted to the peculiarities and conditions of the different countries. The Reformation meant a seizure of the property of the Catholic church, but it had a different course in England, Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia. The French Revolution brought along the confiscation of the noblemen’s estates. But though most of the ideas of the French Revolution were adopted little by little even in conservative Germany, the Germans copied only that which they considered useful for themselves, and the German nobleman kept their estates.”

That is why, when I hear a British Communist declaring that “we are going to do exactly as the Bolsheviks have done,” that I look upon him as an enthusiastic fool. We’ve had enough froth in our movement, let us have a little more dispassionate study, a little more judgment, a little more wisdom and sagacity. We are not going to do what the Bolsheviks did, partly because we can’t, and partly because it won’t be necessary. We have got to go one better than the Bolsheviks. Get a grip of that fact. Kamenev and any other student of both countries admit it. “Anyone,” says Kamenev, “who imagines that the dictatorship will not be necessary instead of more necessary in the Western countries than it was in Russia, is a fool.” I agree with him and I think

number increased to 30,000. In all the provinces, propaganda-weeks were set aside for obtaining new members, from October, 1919, to January, 1920. After re-registration of members and elimination of those unreliable, there remained in this section but 120,000. After completion of the propaganda, this number was increased to 320,000. In October the membership was lowest, not merely as a result of the process of elimination, but also because in the terrific battles on all fronts in 1919, a great number of the best comrades had fallen.

Now, as mentioned, it is considerably over 600,000, fifty-two per cent. of which are workers, twenty-five per cent. soldiers, and the remainder agriculturists, intelligentsia, etc.

The Secretariat has the following departments—(1) Agitation and Propaganda; (2) Registration of competent workers and their assignments all over the country; (3) Organisation and Instruction; (4) Information and Statistics; (5) Work in the Villages; (6) Work among Labourers and Women in the country; (7) For Minority Nationalities; (8) Office of the Directorate combined with the Department of Finance. When I was in Moscow the Central Committee decided that the Department of Registration was to be enlarged so that each of the 600,000 members in all Russia should have his own special card, upon which should be entered the chief data in his life, activity and possible offences, etc. Further, there is now in press a general legitimization book for the entire bulk of the party.

The Communist Party of Russia is the only political party in the world which, not only in its tactics, but also in its organisation, is guided by scientific principles.

In Moscow alone, there are thirteen organised districts with 680 trade and other groups operating in the various spheres of activity. Over 300 lectures and 500 meetings are held every month in the city and its environs. Every inhabitant is kept in touch with the Party work, and with social and political ideas. Sergieff explained to me the conditions of membership in pretty much these words: “We have always con-



THE DELEGATES.

I have already shown why. If it is to be more necessary, then, it must be more powerfully prepared and organised; it must be vastly superior to the Russian dictatorship; in short, we must have a better organisation here than the Bolsheviks had in Russia. It may well be advisable then to consider the Russian model of a Communist Party. The essential difference between the R.C.P. and the old “Bolshevik,” so far as organisation is concerned, is merely one of numerical strength. The fundamental bases of membership was the same in the old as in the new. It is now over 600,000 strong. When Deniken and Judenitch were attacking Russia, the Communist Party only numbered 13,287 members. They organised a special week’s propaganda to enrol recruits, and at the end of the week the

centrated on manoeuvre in order to obtain the biggest results from the weakest of forces. The Party ought to be like a lever so that a great success may result from a feeble effort. We are trying to bring the Co-operative Commonwealth to birth without having to meander through the capitalist process of production first, and in consequence the highest possible methods of scientific organisation must be adopted by the Party which is attempting, not a social experiment, but the conscious guiding of a new social system come to birth. For this reason we must combine the highest degree of knowledge with the practical experience of the working classes. We are led by tried, strong authorities. We are held together by iron discipline. According to present statutes (rules of organisation) of the party, who

ever wishes to become a member, must be recommended by two old members. He does not immediately become a member, merely a sympathetic candidate at first. Only after six months can the Executive Committee accept him as a member. As a candidate, he has the right to be present at all meetings (except secret ones), but he cannot vote. The workers and landless peasants may, upon special recommendation, have this term shortened. Also during special propaganda "party weeks" members are accepted without these formalities. The greatest co-operation is offered by the All-Russian Congress, then comes the Central Executive Committee, after that the Executive Committee of the provinces, districts, and cities. The chief nucleus of the organisation is then a village, a factory, an industrial enterprise, or a military division. In each of these units are Communists, whose duty it is to form organisations. Even though there are but three, they are obliged to form a "yacheyka" (a group) to meet for consultation to study all questions and to act in union. Discussions are entirely free. But once a decision is reached, everyone must work along the same plan. The decision of the highest institution must be carried out without any protest.

This is pure Marxism. "The conscious guiding of a new social system come to birth," is the very essence of the message conveyed by Marx and Engels when they formulated the Materialist Conception of History. The most dreadful foe on earth is the foe with its back to the wall. In no sense can autocracy be said to have had its back to the wall in 1917 (March). It simply collapsed like a pricked bladder. Nor had the bourgeoisie faction its back to the wall in November, 1917. The bourgeoisie did not fully realise the danger of the situation any more than they had grasped the full significance of the Revolution already achieved.

Our bourgeoisie already has its back to the wall, it is hitting out right and left—it is we, the Communists, who are anaemic. We who talk about Marxism instead of doing it, obey the letter and forget the spirit, make our own party antagonisms of prime importance and forget the enemy at the gate. This is the road to disaster, for all the titanic struggles that ever were waged in the universal class war, this one, the organised world Capitalism against world Communism, is the greatest. But world Communism must conquer, and it cannot conquer without world unity, and world unity is not possible without the Third International. These facts ought to be self-evident. There is no question of a "Moscow dictatorship" involved in being attached to the Third International. No body of men in another country can control any but the broadest and most fundamental tactics of the movement abroad. The International must have its centre, and, as President Zinovieff points out, where is there a better centre to-day than Moscow?

Nowhere! But let us have something to contribute to the International. Let us make a movement here worthy of the International. Shouting "all power to the Soviets" when there are no Soviets is a ridiculous kind of pastime. Bellowing "workers of all lands unite!" when we are not only disunited ourselves, but actually wrangling over the conditions laid down for world unity, is scarcely the action of sane men and women. We have got to get into the Third International, and mean it. We have got to work like Trojans to bring our industrially organised workers over to the Red International. We have got to smash every effort to build up another treacherous "International" such as our Mensheviks dream of, and we have got to fight relentlessly the manipulators of the Yellow Amsterdam International. Organisation, discipline, and common sense must be our first consideration; selflessness, devotion, and heroism will follow in time. To emulate the Russians in these things will be wisdom. To copy their tactics under our conditions, and without their backbone, will be the acme of folly. Self, petty, miserable, self must be subordinated. That will be a mighty conquest. Lenin once called Trotsky a "phrase-spinner"; he also called him "our Kautskyan friend." When Lenin sneers he doesn't forget to sneer hard. What happened? Absolutely nothing except the accession of a little more

wisdom on the part of Trotsky. Trotsky is a big man, one of the biggest men on earth. Had he been some fifteenth-rater in the British movement he would probably have hated Lenin like poison for having wounded his dignity (actually his stupid vanity) by sneering at him. He would have left the party. To get his own private revenge he would have sabotaged the entire world movement. Such is one deplorable characteristic of the little Britisher, because in nine cases out of ten our Communists are Communists in name, but the most rabid individualists in nature. One of the noblest and loftiest panegyrics on Lenin has just been written, and its author is—Leon Trotsky. That is the spirit we must cultivate here. We have got to down the old Adam. We have got to use our Communist principles, not merely parade them. We have got to have a well-stocked warehouse, not merely a shop window nicely dressed. We have got to use our knowledge by translating it into action, not use it by slinging phrases about that mean nothing, but ought to mean a great deal. Take the word "discipline" for instance. We shan't be able to enforce discipline in our Party immediately. Comrade Kamenev has appreciated that fact. But some dogmatic, unbending officials will attempt to do so, because they will become as much slaves to the mere word "discipline" as others now are to some of those phrases which excite the sarcasms of Mr. Phillip Snowden. Discipline must, like everything else, be taught, and during the process many little and some big misdemeanours will have to be overlooked. A soldier is taught discipline; why not teach a Communist? It is the same with the word "Marxism." How many believe that all that Marxism involves is the ability to repeat lessons from "Das Kapital" with the facility of an electionist reciting "Eugene Aram" or "Tam o' Shanter." The "Marxian scholar" is little short of an intolerable nuisance. As the Congress declared, the time has arrived when dogmas, doctrines, and phrases ought to be pensioned off and deeds substituted for them. "The world to-day is calling for fighters not philosophers." With the entire world system of Capitalism battling for its very existence there are British Communists who can find nothing better to do than arrange meetings whereat they may discuss "organisation from the bottom up or from the top down," or some other equally fatuous question, when they ought to be doing any little thing which will further cripple their dying but still dangerous enemy. The brainless young men who meet in ice-cream shops to expatiate on the merits and demerits of the football champions to the exclusion of all else, are not one whit worse. And there is one notorious weakness which will have to be eradicated from the British Communist character—a totally ludicrous and unjustifiable conceit. From it has sprung most of the personal antipathies, hatreds, errors, and jealousies which have done so much to bring the movement into contempt. I can remember one week when nearly every prominent revolutionary paper contained a panegyric upon its respective editor, and written by that editor. What clownishness! Is there a greater privilege on earth than to be able to work and give one's best to the holiest of all causes? What a miserable creature is that, then, who cannot strive without flattery, even the empty flattery of himself. It is due, so the psycho-analysts say, to the "superiority complex," which makes the artistic idiot wear long hair and affect a flowing cravat, and which no doubt explains the popularity of the old S.D.F. sombrero and scarlet tie. He must be in the centre of the picture or his cake is all dough. What there is to be conceited about the Lord alone knows. We all have our work to do, and if we excel over others in the performance of it, that is all to the good of the cause, and we should be pleased for that reason only. But this continual wearing of a halo, and reiteration of self-righteousness—"thank God I am not as other men are," therefore clap me on the back, is the more sickening pharisaism, because the Pharisees are so-called Communists. Where we might reasonably expect to find a fairly thick layer of vanity—in a Marx, a Darwin, or a Lenin, we find none at all. The writers of twopenny pamphlets, diabolical poems, and in-

consequential articles, and the deliverers of revolutionary orations, appear to have appropriated the world's supply. The humour of it is that these very people whose self-superiority bursts the buttons from their waistcoats and ruins the shape of their hats, would smile largely at the boasting of an ignorant farm hand who can accomplish, in very many cases, an artistic miracle which they themselves are incapable of. With two clumsy shire horses, two long rope lines, and two cwt. of iron called a plough, he can cut a rig down a twenty-five acre field with the geometrical precision of a plumb-line, depending solely upon his magnificent skill as a ploughman. Why then should we countenance this arrogant and objectionable form of egotism in an "intellectual," when we find it so nauseating in a "clod-hopper"? It is usually a trifle more pronounced in the person who speaks about the "ego" and who gibes at altruism. Everyone according to this oracle, does nothing but what he or she is prompted to do by factors which he or she does not control. If such is the case, then none have any cause to be vain about gifts they possess or deeds they have performed, inasmuch as in any case they couldn't help it. The main thing to-day is to forget that such an extraordinary and picturesque figure as oneself is in existence, and to get on with the work one feels best fitted to do. There are many little weaknesses we must overcome before the big job ahead of us can be successfully grappled with, leave alone successfully achieved; and until they are overcome the British "movement" will be conspicuous for its immobility: in short, it will remain a—joke.

A very nice story the prisoner was telling of an offence alleged against him, of which he was wholly guiltless—he, a man against whom there had never before been a breath of suspicion.

"Prisoner, pardon me one moment," interrupted the judge. "You must speak a little louder; I cannot catch what you say. What was your last sentence?"

"Six months, m'lud," came the amazing reply.

As long as the State power remains in the hands of the owners of industry, THEY will be the dictators over the workers. No seizure of factory, or mill, or mine by the workers will avail anything for the workers as long as the power of the State, the guns, soldiers, bayonets, the political control, remain in their hands.

Uncle (a self-made man)—"An' wot are they larnin' ye at school, Halbert?"

Albert—"French, Greek, Latin, Algebra, and Euclid."

Uncle—"Well, let's test ye. Wot's the Euclid for onion?"

Labour won the war. Now it has to fight those who MADE the war. Some reward!

A fragment of a Lancashire conversation:—He says, "Con tha' jazz?" I says, "Jazz?" He says, "Aye." I says, "Who?" He says, "Thee." I says, "Me?" He says, "Aye." I says, "No."

Editor—"Why don't you make your story true to life?"

Author—"What's the matter with it?"

Editor—"What's the matter with it? Why, here you say that 'There is the sound of a shot, and immediately the street swarmed with policemen.'"

Every original thinker is an earthquake and scares some others—some out of their senses and some into 'em.—"The International," Johannesburg.

Our job is to organise as a class for the purpose of overthrowing the profit system; to take control of industry and government. Then we can produce what we need and give no part of our product to idle parasites. Under this system there will be neither over-production nor under-consumption; no panics, no hunger, no wars.

Social Genius in Russia.

Social genius is rapidly growing in Russia. Inventors, scientists, workers, artists hasten to place the results of their inspiration—of their genius—at the disposal of the commonwealth.

The common good is the common desire. It used to be urged against Socialism—against Communism—that it would result in a dead levelling of humanity; that no initiative would be given the inventor to invent; that genius would be crushed, annihilated. What is happening in Russia proves the contrary to be the case. The floodgates are opened. From all quarters come news of new discoveries.

"Necessity," it has often been said, "is the mother of invention." Necessity has made the Russians do many strange things, many novel things. Necessity provided, in the first instance, the urge to social genius, discovered the need for innovation and invention. Now the tide is in full flood.

A recent article in "Pravda" describes the opening of the locomotive repair works at Podolsk, which already employs about 3,000 workers. "The works," says "Pravda," "have not been re-shaped from some other establishment. There were on hand only unfinished walls and a pile of rubbish. Now we have there a beautiful giant. How much of design and inventiveness was revealed during its construction? How much love was put into the work by the technicians and by the chief engineer who managed the works? There was no metal for trusses, so they found out a new way of combining metal with timber, and built fine trusses with eighty per cent. of timber; there were no lathes, and so they got old revolving lathes and fitted them up in different original methods; there was no hard steel for saws, so they adopted the method of rapid rotation, which allows soft steel to cut metal by melting it through this rapid rotation and the great heat which is generated by the friction. And tens of other large and small inventions were adopted by the builders during the construction of the new works."

What happened in the building of the works at Podolsk is symptomatic. The same thing is happening all over Russia. Workers who love their work, who are keenly interested in its success, who watch it develop under their hands with creative delight, use all their ingenuity, give all their genius.

An electric station has been built in the Moscow province, in which the boilers of submarines have been transformed and utilised.

A sensation has been caused in the electrical world by the construction of Comrade Makonin's electric train. It consists of three motor carriages and three tender-cars. On the former the electric motors are arranged, and on the latter accumulators of unusual power. The cars are constructed on the Pullman style. Each car accommodates eight persons, besides which there is a sleeping car.

The experiment with the train was in every way successful. It travelled from Petrograd to Moscow—at a speed of from 60 to 85 versts an hour—without a single re-load. The importance of the experiment is far-reaching. It will probably lead to the wide electrification of the Russian railroads, revolutionising transport.

Experiments made with the new electrical accumulator invented by the worker Ulintsoff has given very satisfactory results. The new accumulator utilises the force of the wind. Now the first wind electrical station is being established at Kursk.

So one might go on giving instances of the progress of social genius in Russia.

The Soviet Republic has this advantage over the capitalist countries. It can immediately utilise the discoveries of its inventors without being hampered by trusts, capitalist cliques, and associations of employers. And it can utilise them, not in the narrow and limited way inventions are utilised by private individuals or capitalist corporations, but fully for the benefit of the whole people.

Moreover, it encourages inventors by giving them full and free opportunity of carrying out experiments. It does not crush them beneath a weight of restrictions or choke them with poverty. The inventors realise this. They know also that what they are doing is for the good of all and not for the enrichment of some fat capitalist or lord moneybags.

TOM QUELCH.

* * * * *

He who controls your job, controls you, your bread, your life. He dictates the terms by which you live, your wages, your hours, your amusements, your family life (or lack of it). He is the ruler over you. He is your Dictator.

As It Should Be.

A Reply to "In Debt."

An eight-page leaflet has been issued by the Government through the Trade Union to all members in the A.E.U. entitled "In Debt." On reading the leaflet one gathers that its object is to persuade the workers in the engineering industry to accept 8,910 ex-service men into the trades.

On page 2 we are told "men of all shades of opinion acknowledged his bravery then—when he fought our battles." Surely not our battles; we were under the impression it was the bosses' battles, and judging by the manner in which the spoil was distributed we see no reason to change our opinion. We do not own the country (although we could). We do not govern the country. We have no say in the making of war or the signing of peace. How, then, may we ask, could they be our battles?

The suggestion contained in this leaflet is that the ex-soldier is prevented by the trade unionist from earning his living, when, as a matter of fact, the trade unionist in the engineering industry, even with a long period of training and experience, finds it difficult to obtain employment.

The leaflet goes on:—"We are in the midst of another battle—a battle for industrial supremacy." For what purpose, may we ask, is this "industrial efficiency?" For a similar purpose as the military efficiency" was desirable—just as the workers were wanted to fight the bosses' military battles, so they are now required to fight the bosses' economic battles. Further on a reference is made to the engineers' fear of dilution. The modern engineer does not fear dilution. The danger of the dilutee to the working class would only be real if he were ignorant of his class position, and even then he would be no more dangerous than a skilled craftsman with the same outlook.

On page 6 we find the following:—"The trade unionist in the shop is asked to co-operate with these men as work-mates, and assist them to equip themselves for the battle of life." What is the battle of life? The battle of life for the working class is merely a battle amongst themselves for the available jobs. We will assist them for the battle of life all right—the real battle, the battle for possession of the tools. It would then be to our interests that all workers should be skilled in a variety of crafts, so that the wants of humanity could be more easily met.

The question we have to face at present is—Can the effects of the competition be lessened by taking these men into our union? Because, after all, they are going to be trained for the industry whether we like it or not, and like other workers will have no choice but to sell what skill they have in return for the means of life.

We are asked to recognise our debt to the ex-soldiers. We are not in debt to the ex-soldier, but society is indebted to us, and we are determined that debt shall be repaid. Being unable to demand repayment as individuals, we propose the reorganisation of society in such a way that it will be possible to pay it collectively. This can only be done when we have made the workers collectively the owners of the tools of wealth production now owned by the master class, and used by that class for the extraction of profit from those who operate those tools. Incidentally, we will not forget our debt to the master class.

We have served the rich for a thousand years,
Sparing neither age nor sex,
White slaves in their hives of industry,
White rats in their sinking wrecks.
By sea and by track they turn us back
From all that makes life fair;
The blood of our martyred class cries out—
Lord God! there's a debt to square.

On behalf of the A.E.U. Group of Socialist Industrial Unionists.

J. HENDERSON and D. S. MORTON,
Joint Secretaries.

* * * * *

Modern war is the safest game in the world and the great commanders are only seen nowadays at the "head" of an army when it is in retreat. No matter what happens to the rank and file, the real capitalist "heroes" always land safely in Paris, London, or Berlin.

Reaction in Spain.

Scant is the news that is coming from Spain. The medium of transmission is in the hands of the capitalist agencies, which, in accordance with their usual methods, keep the rest of the world in the dark with regard to the real economic and political state of the country. Only garbled accounts reach us of the tyrannies of reaction from which no country has been spared that has come out of the war as "victor" or war-profitteer. And Spain was a war-profitteer to a high degree. Its neutrality was dictated by necessity, by its open seaboard, its colonies, and in order not to expose its commerce to the English guns. It catered for the Entente and the hyenas of capital, the wire-pullers, and usurers, gathered in the towns, as in every other neutral country. Trade flourished, the wealth of the privileged increased, and at the same time the antagonism of the lower classes became more intense. The subsequent result of capitalist usury was an increase in the cost of living. The conditions of the wage workers became so bad that they led to a series of social struggles, in the course of which many comrades were imprisoned, the trades union leaders murdered, the unions broken up and martial law proclaimed. The whole affair has been characterised by capitalist corruption and terror. Arising out of the hard struggles of the Spanish workers, which have taken place in the few industrial towns of the country, especially Barcelona, the Executive of the Spanish Trade Union Alliance have issued the following appeal. It is particularly aimed at Dato's government, who has degraded himself to the hangman's servant of reaction. The manifesto reads as follows:—

COMRADES!

"The moment has arrived for us to turn to all the class-conscious workers and really free men of the world in order to depict the position of the Spanish workers, which has been brought about by the cruel and barbarous reaction of our bourgeois and our government.

"We know that the latter, supported by the hired press (the only one that has appeared for many months), are manufacturing and spreading all kinds of lies with the object of misleading international "opinion" about us.

"It is now our duty to proclaim the truth as loudly as possible in order that everyone may learn to what a degree of corruption, dissoluteness, and violence the whole band of rascals has reached, who, under the pretext of governing and protecting the country, are trying to exterminate even the most sober-minded and moderate pioneers of the approaching social transformation.

"For two years the life of the class-conscious and resolute worker has been nothing but a succession of privations and uninterrupted struggles.

"There was, first of all, the abolition of the constitutional guarantees, which has now become a normal condition in the affected industrial provinces of Spain. Then came martial law, which was periodically introduced and used or abused without any plausible reason.

"The trade unions were next closed and declared illegal. Labour newspapers were suppressed in towns like Barcelona, Valencia, Saragossa, and so forth. All meetings and lectures of a social or educational character were banned; the introduction of an implacable censure of all the news that was favourable to the workers or a fair criticism of the petty tyrannies which were executed everywhere; the imprisonment of hundreds and thousands of fighters, and even simple trade unionists without any reason whatever, simply because it pleased the prefect (governor of a district). In fact, it may seem improbable and unheard of in the twentieth century that a governor can, without the dread of responsibility, imprison any person who has been unfortunate enough to displease him, and keep him there for days, months, or years without trial.

"Yet all the means mentioned which have been applied against us and our organisations have not produced the results desired by these bandits.

"We have borne all the blows without weakening, and in the darkest periods of the terror, when our organisations seemed ruined, numerous new forces came to our aid.

"The self-centred bourgeoisie of our country, deluded and frightened as they may be by the revival of the progressive forces, are in no way disposed to surrender the privileges and riches which they have gained by shameless exploitation and thieving, not to mention crimes, and the system of oppression under which we suffer is thereby rendered more acute.

"All the known labour fighters are arrested and deported to Mahon or Fernando Po (the Government term it 'separation').

"Others are murdered in a cowardly manner by bands organised by the employers and supported by the official representatives of the Government, the paid hired members of which have been engaged like police and white guards, called 'somaten' here.

"While others have been sent back 'de conduccion' to their birthplace, which is often hundreds of kilometres from the place where they work, and thus are often driven from one province to another, until it pleases some governor to accept them.

"'De conduccion' means that the unfortunate comrade is compelled to travel on foot to the place named by the officials in order to be imprisoned there. He is escorted by two or four mounted gendarmes, and receives 50 cents per day to feed himself. The brutal police, who accompany our comrades, often beat them cruelly to drive them forward when they are tired, sick, or involuntary slacken the pace or make any attempt to rest.

"This is the lot of our fighters, of our delegates in the workshop, the factory, or the shop, and all of those who have committed the unpardonable crime of rendering a service to a trade union."—Translated from the "Berliner Tagwacht."

J. S.



THE NEW CHRISTIANITY.

As we advance to the overthrow of capitalism and the building of the new society there will be others swept off by the capitalists to the reward prepared for rebellious workers. But at every step forward the march becomes more steady; what was yesterday a straggling group of visionaries it to-day a band of clear-eyed workers with definite knowledge of their ultimate goal and the road they must traverse to its attainment.

* * * * *

"Get ready to run the industries!" That should be the rallying cry to all workers everywhere. It should be shouted at the shop door, on the street among the unemployed, in the union hall, and in every meeting place of the workers. No time to waste on palliatives—capitalism is crumbling.

The Machine.

Mankind owes a great debt to science. Looking back over the last hundred years, we find that science has developed and extended its domain of practical application far beyond the wildest dreams that ever emanated from the overwrought imagination of a medieval necromancer. The most primal forces of nature have been made subject to the will of man. The fecundity of the earth and the productivity of human labour power have been increased a thousand-fold.

Yet, despite the great advantages that mankind has derived from science, poverty and disease coupled with a physical and mental degeneration is the unhappy lot endured by the majority of the world's workers.

The application of science to industry, which under a sane system of society would have meant the emancipation of the working class, has under capitalism proved to be the greatest tyrant of the ages. To-day, men are slaves of the worst type, and the degradation of to-day never had its equal not even in the early days of slavery. The machine to-day employs man and sweats him; it also is the means of throwing him out of a job and starving him.

The discovery and the application of steam-power, with the consequent concentration and development of the machine in the place of the handicraft worker, marked the birth of extensive capitalism, and the inception of what is known as the industrial revolution. The introduction gave England its factory system. It is safe to say that the child slavery of that period has never been equalled. The misery of the people became so acute that they banded together for the purpose of smashing the machines. They thought that the replacement of their skilled hand labour by the use of the machine was responsible for their inhuman conditions, and due to their ignorance they wildly hoped to deliver themselves from poverty and misery by destroying the machine.

When we gaze down the dim vista of the ages and watch the ever-onward march of man, from the time our primeval ancestors roamed the forest in the full glory of their pristine jungle savagery to the present day, we are confronted with this irrefutable fact, that in the evolution of human society, each stage of progress contains within itself the germ of its own destruction, which in turn is the pregnant seed from which the succeeding stage of advancement is formed. Thus we see that the introduction of the machine process made the capitalist system possible; and so must the continuing development of the machine process, together with the corresponding economic conditions made the future society possible.

The continued education and organisation of the working class will mean the eventual control of the machine by the working class. With the assuming of control of industry by the working class the machine will then be the servant of mankind, and not mankind its slave.

* * * * *

Working-Class Morality.

By T. YOUNG.

The present conditions of life throughout the world are fast generating in the minds of the working class a new morality. Hitherto the great majority of this class have accepted without question the 'standard of morality' imposed upon them by their lords and masters—who graciously allow some of them to work for their living—and preached so assiduously by a prostitute church. This 'standard of morality' is very clearly defined in the oft-repeated priestly admonition to the workers: to be 'satisfied with the position in life to which it has pleased God to call them.' This is 'capitalist morality,' based like all morality on self-interest, and in that respect it is undoubtedly for them 'true morality.' In order to successfully continue to foist this capitalist morality upon the workers, it was and is an imperative necessity that they should be satisfied with their conditions of life. The failure of capitalism to keep the workers satisfied by moral means—and the resort to force—has caused the workers to think; and when the worker begins to think for himself, capitalist morality for the worker is no longer effective. The terrible conditions of life, brought to the workers by capitalism, are compelling them to realise that morality is, in the first instance, an individual question; and, secondly, a class question based on self-interest. Therefore there is no morality for the worker except his own; nothing is good, unless it is good for him; and nothing that is good for him can, by any stan-

dard of workers' morality, be made bad. Of what use is it to place food within the reach of a starving man and tell him: Thou shalt not steal? Privation and self-interest scatters all the pre-conceived notions of morality acquired in periods of satisfaction and contentment! This is clearly seen in a quotation from "Positive Philosophy" (J. Dietzgen)—"Man is a living personality, whose welfare and purpose is embodied in himself, who has between himself and the world nothing but his needs as mediator, who owes no allegiance to any law, from the moment that it contravenes his needs." It is this mediator which makes the hungry man an angry man. How can you expect the starving unemployed to pay any regard to the laws of capitalist morality? His starving children compel him to see that this smug capitalist morality is grossly immoral for him and his class, and is rapidly forcing him unconsciously to create his own standard of morality, based on his own self-interest and the interest of his class. The working class is passing from the gloom of intellectual darkness—fostered by capitalist morality—into the light of scientific Socialism. Travelling along this path he quickly meets a formidable antagonist in the prevalent belief in the supernatural. The teaching of science in recent years has given the worker a powerful weapon against this mystical foe. Armed with the knowledge of natural law in the physical world, he quickly overcomes this ally of Capitalism, and with his brain cleared of the cob-webs of ancient myths and mysticism, he goes on to establish his own code of morality, based on a scientific programme, for his emancipation from wage slavery, and the happiness of his own class.

By the abolition of classes, the workers' morality would become universal morality; for the good of one would be the good of all. The worker is like the capitalist in one respect: he is very jealous of his own happiness, and does not hesitate to sacrifice even "God and his commandments" as soon as they are opposed to his needs. The ancient moral code, adopted in part by Christianity, because of its suitability to the idea of private ownership of the means of life, is totally inefficient for a properly organised system of society, and would be utterly ineffective in a Communist society. A morality that looks for happiness in another world, is no inducement to the scientific mind of the 20th century worker—whose one aim is to increase the sum total of human welfare and happiness.

* * * * *

League of Nations, or Freedom?

Of all the hideous, monstrous lies with which the workers of the world have ever been beguiled to their own undoing, perhaps the most vicious is the vast string of lies about the virtues of the League of Nations. The purpose of the lies that have been told of the virtues of the various lands of the nativity of the various nations has in the past been of the worst. But here comes a thing so monstrous that it can only be compared to the lies about the virtues of one's country as the world is greater than a single nation. And the object for which the lies are told is as much greater as the world is greater than the nation. The object is the enslavement of the world to a single group of capitalists.

The League of Nations—despite the high-sounding phrases spoken in its praise—is nothing less than the Capitalist International. The great world war was fought for no other reason than to settle the matter of which group of capitalists should have the divine right to exploit the productive workers of the world. It seems that the war went further than its architects intended. For this reason it is now necessary for them to all join hands to prevent, even for a time, the complete overthrow of the capitalist system. So far there has been but little unity of action between them, but it will not be long until the capitalism of all the world will be under one chief command, even as the allied armies were, in 1918, under the command of General Foch. The logic of events is driving them together in the last desperate stand to save to themselves the slave system that has been the attribute of capitalism since feudalism was overthrown. With them it is hold-all and extend their influence, or lose-all. The pretensions of nationality are thrown to the winds.

The line-up now is world capitalism against the world's proletariat. World capitalism will endeavour to fasten upon the world a perpetual slave system. The League of Nations is the instrument for that enslavement. Opposed to this must be the intelligent World-Allied Proletariat with a definite programme and determination for freedom.

THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL.

By E. BURNS.

When the Amsterdam International met in London in November, the main item in the bill of fare was "the World Situation." The Executive had ready a tremendous memorandum, telling how awful was the present state of the workers everywhere and how capitalism was everywhere uniting to deprive the workers of their liberties (!) and economic security (!!). The picture was quite well drawn, up to a point: "The misery of the Hungarian working class is indescribable. . . . The ruling class in Finland have taken sanguinary revenge on all associated with Labour. . . . In Spain constitutional privileges have been suspended; the rights of combinations, assembly and free speech have been withdrawn. . . . In Greece there had been a proposal to draft into the army in Asia Minor the men under 35 who took part in a general strike last May. . . . In the United States strikers shot down with the assistance of soldiery and of Pinkerton agents. . . . In Britain an Emergency Powers Bill authorising the prosecution in every conceivable manner of officials and members of Trade Unions. . . ."

Such was the situation with which the Conference was faced; and we have now to examine what action was taken.

The action recommended by the Executive was to pass three resolutions. The first protested against military or commercial war with Russia, and against all attempts of the dominant class throughout the world to suppress the freedom of organisation and action of the workers; approved the use of the general strike and international boycott; thanked the workers who took part in stopping the transport of munitions for the Armies of the White Terror in Hungary; and finally declared in favour of "international mass action in the assault on reaction, in declaring war against war, and for the realisation of a new social system."

Now, this resolution sounds all right; and yet it was not passed unanimously. Apart from the Canadian vote (which was cast against practically every resolution, as being too extreme) Norway and Italy voted against it. And they voted against the resolutions for very good reasons. The Italian delegate said he was glad that the International had begun to turn its attention to these matters, but he could not support the resolution, because it was simply futile. It did not propose any definite action; and he reminded the delegates that the International was itself largely responsible for the reactionary situation described by the Executive, because the Trade Union leaders identified with the Amsterdam International had co-operated with the capitalist class throughout the war.

The Executive could not put up any reply to this; but when the Canadian delegate expressed the opinion that the International was in danger of becoming a revolutionary body, J. H. Thomas assured him from the Chair that the delegates present were the "mildest mannered people who ever scuttled a ship."

And the Italian delegate's question as to what action the International proposed to take, was very well answered. There can be no doubt that the delegates were the mildest mannered people; and the ship they scuttled was the workers' movement. Take the case of Russia, always the acid test. The resolution protested against the military and commercial war on Russia; but in fact it proposed no definite action to stop it; and a little later on in the proceedings the real attitude of the Amsterdam International towards Russia was expressed in a resolution attacking the Soviet Government and appealing to the Russian workers to join the Amsterdam International! Now it is not surprising that, starting out with this attitude towards the Soviet Government the Amsterdam International should not propose to take any definite action to force the Allied Governments to make peace and trade with Russia. And in fact, though the Soviet revolution, and the world-wide attacks on it by capitalism, have been far the most tremendous events for the workers during the last three years, the Amsterdam International has done nothing but pass a few resolutions, with its tongue in its cheek, and followed by resolutions attacking the Soviet Government and all its works.

Another typical instance of the mentality of the Amsterdam

International was its reception without criticism of an attack on the Soviet Government, alleged to emanate from "The Ural Trade Unions." This letter said that "The leaders of the Russian Trade Unions are severely and cruelly persecuted by the Soviet Government," and complaining that "All the workmen's unions have been turned by the Soviet Government into Governmental institutions which do not organise trade disputes nor fight for the workman's ideals."

Now the first and most obvious criticism of this letter is that it begins: "We learn from the Press that an International Trade Union Congress is now going on in London." Clearly then this letter was written from somewhere nearer than the Urals; and we seem to remember that some time ago four "trade unionists" were imported from the Urals by a very pronouncedly anti-Bolshevik organisation, for the purpose of carrying on anti-Bolshevik propaganda among the British workers. And three of them later repudiated the said anti-Bolshevik organisation, saying that they had been misled. Can the letter from "the Ural Trade Unionists" have been written by the fourth imported propagandist, who remained "loyal"? If not, who wrote it? Trade Unionists from the Urals are not very thick on the ground; and how do they manage to pay their fare over here on the miserable roubles they get from the Bolsheviks? However, Thomas read the alleged letter from them to the Conference without raising these questions.

The second point about the letter is a more important one, one that really shows up the Amsterdam International. The writers of the letter knew that the Amsterdam International would be horrified to find that in Russia "the workmen's unions have been turned into Government institutions which do not organise trade disputes nor fight for the workman's ideals. What a horrible state of things for the British Trade Union leader to contemplate! No more trade disputes to organise; no more going to Downing Street to "fight for the workman's ideals"; no more compliments from the Press on their "moderation" and "statesmanship" when they have scuttled the ship by a compromise which gives the workers nothing! Wouldn't it be a terrible blow for J. H. Thomas, President of the Amsterdam International!

Yes, in that sentence—the Trade Unions in Russia do not organise trade disputes nor fight for the worker's ideals—we have the kernel of the difference between official Trade Unionism, as represented in the Amsterdam International, and the new spirit of the workers' movement which will express itself in the Red Trade Union International. The Red Trade Union International does not want to identify itself with those whose highest aim is to organise trade disputes and fight for the workers' ideals. Trade disputes and fighting for the workers' ideals belong to the era of Capitalism; and of course they have disappeared in the new Russia. Let any one who wants to know the position in Russia read "Trade Unions in Soviet Russia," which contains a full account of their history and present position, written by Lozovsky; and let him also read Lozovsky's small book on the International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions, in which he shows the futility of the Amsterdam International and the need for the new Red Trade Union International, which is to be established at the forthcoming May-Day Congress in Moscow.

Therein lies the difference: the Amsterdam International represents the point of view of Trade Union leaders who regard Capitalism as a permanent institution, and only look forward to doing the best they can under it; the Red International, filled with the spirit of a country from which Capitalism has been abolished, looks to the workers in every country to rally under its standard for the final overthrow of Capitalism.

So much for the first resolution of the Amsterdam International. In my next article I will show how its policy, as described above, permeated its further proceedings and revealed the mentality of its leaders in connection with the Capitalist League of Nations and Capitalist Governments.

The Wriggling of a Politician.

By W. GALLACHER.

What an injured innocent is the Hon. Member for Govan! He has given so much service to the movement—and really we ought to leave him alone. But he isn't alone with that wail. Blatchford, Hyndman, Tillet, and a whole host of others are all claiming the same virtue. The only trouble is that they don't say what the service is.

One thing we know, however, is that men like Blatchford by their activities gained the ear of a large section of the workers, and then led them into the arms of the Imperialist Government. That was betrayal of the workers. Will the Hon. Member for Govan find fault with me if I call them traitors? Has he not called them traitors himself—when it suited him? To say that we should concentrate on the Capitalist enemy in itself justifies any attack we may make on a "traitor, fakir, and fraud," for he is essentially an "ally" of the Capitalists.

It must ever be the work of the revolutionaries, while fighting the boss class, to expose most mercilessly those who would mislead or betray the workers.

Having got that over, will M'Lean, M.P., face the argument put up? There is no use trying to cloud the issue by asking why I didn't interfere at the meeting referred to. He knows why I didn't take part in it, for the simple reason that I told him why myself. A week before his meeting the "Record" came out with a two-column "stunt" about a "scene" at a meeting in Renfrew Street, in which I figured rather prominently, and I had no desire to give them another opportunity of filling their columns at my expense. To have a scene one week with one M'Lean was bad enough, but to have another scene the following week with another M'Lean would have been a bit too much.

Then again there was no serious reason why I should have taken part in the affair. The "young Communists" weren't at all troubled by the encounter. They are quite prepared to tackle the "prodigious" Neil if he comes back again.

Such answers as he gave were puerile in the extreme. To call a questioner a clown and sneer at another because he mispronounced a word isn't scoring off the Communists; it is simply a demonstration of the miserable shuffling of a politician who is afraid to face the consequences of his own actions.

Regarding the question about the "Mason's," he has still to deny it. One thing sure, there are quite a number of our precious "leaders" attached to this order, and we do know that one of the deputation that waited on the Lord Provost at the 40 hours' strike made use of it.

If M'Lean isn't a "Mason" let him say so and be done with it, and when he is at it will he tell us what the "dirty lie" is that the Communists are alleged to have circulated about him?

Then will he face this? At the meeting referred to he said that Lloyd George in his Radical days had called the Dukes "mongrels." Now, he argued, Lloyd George has joined the Dukes, and we are justified in calling him a "mongrel." Does the Hon. Member deny having said that Lloyd George is a "mongrel"? Very good. But when Lloyd George was a Radical attacking the Dukes, Neil M'Lean was a revolutionary S.L.P. attacking M'Donald, Snowden, and the Labour Party leaders generally as "traitors, fakirs, and frauds." Surely then, if it is justifiable to call Lloyd George a "mongrel" because he is among the "Dukes," it is equally justifiable to call M'Lean a "traitor, fakir, and fraud" now he is among the gang he was so anxious to expose before he was expelled from the S.L.P. If there is anything wrong with this argument, will he kindly put me right? There is no sense in suggesting that I am a mudlark. I don't have to accuse him of being a "traitor," etc., his own argument damns him.

Neither is there sense in dragging in Lenin's pamphlet on "Infantile Sickness" and giving the impression that it is written about me. It is a pamphlet of 100 pages, and only one page is devoted to the criticism of a letter of mine which appeared in the "Workers' Dreadnought." Apart from that letter Lenin didn't know of my existence, so that it is stretching things a bit to suggest that the sub-title has anything to do with "Gallacher." However, I hope every reader of the "Worker" will get the pamphlet. It will well repay the closest study.

The other point I wish to deal with before closing is the one about Bolshevism and Socialism. Anyone reading what M'Lean has to say on the matter would naturally come to the conclusion that I or someone else had been asking him to label himself Bolshevik. Such, however, is not the case. Why should we ask M'Lean or anyone else to call himself a Bolshevik? The Bolsheviks in Russia are the Revolutionary Socialists of Russia, and any revolutionary in this country will be only too pleased to line up along with them.

But the trouble with M'Lean is that before going to Parliament he claimed to be a Bolshevik, was found to be a Bolshevik, and then denied being one when challenged in the House of Commons.

He denies that my description of what took place is correct, and here is how he puts it: "Let me make the position plain. Churchill was replying to a speech I made in the House on Russia, and quoted from a newspaper article. I immediately rose and pointed out that the quotation did not represent what I had said. A number of members who had heard me make the speech agreed with my correction, and Churchill withdrew the further reading of the article. There was no laughter—that is an hallucination on Gallacher's part, as for snivelling, neither Churchill nor Gallacher will ever make me do that."

Now in the first place I challenge the Hon. Member to give the name of one solitary member who got up and supported his correction. In the second place, if his correction, which I am about to quote, wasn't snivelling, then I would like to know what is. In the third place and for the third time, I assert that the House laughed at him, by which I mean the Coalition and Independent Liberals. The Labour members didn't laugh; they were as sick as their colleague.

While M'Lean was speaking Seddon butted in with "you are a declared Bolshevik. M'Lean said he was a Socialist, but didn't call himself a Bolshevik, and here is what followed, taken from "Hansard":—

Mr Churchill.—The House has listened to a lively speech from the Hon. Member opposite, which is I think his first appearance in the responsible position of speaking from the front opposition bench. (Cries of "No.") At anyrate it is the first I have had the good fortune to hear, and I must say I observe that a growing responsibility is exercising its usual effect upon the hon. gentleman, and as he approaches the centre of power his political creed has become more carefully defined. He told us he was not a Bolshevik, but on the 27th of June at Southport I am credibly informed the hon. gentleman said: "I stand for the Bolshevik regime. The Bolshevik Government, whatever their faults, are fighting the battle of our class in Russia, and I appeal to you to back them up."

Now the hon. gentleman says he is not a Bolshevik, and ranks himself with those Socialists who are, as we have been told, the special objects of Bolshevik resentment.

Mr M'Lean.—This is the second time this quotation has been used against me. It was used on a previous occasion at a meeting of the Labour Party. What I said at Southport on that occasion, and I think Hon. Members who were present will admit that what I say is correct, was this. I was pointing out what was happening in Russia, and I said that if I had to choose between the Czarist regime and the Bolshevik regime, I would choose the Bolshevik. Those were my words.

Churchill.—Then the words must have been taken down wrongly by the reporter. We know that these mistakes do happen, and are alleged to happen, when one sees next day something which one would rather not have said. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong if he thinks I quoted this reference to his speech for the purpose of reproaching him. On the contrary, I was complimenting him on the increasing gravity of his political position, etc., etc.

Laugh, the House shook with laughter, and the Hon. Member for Govan could only whine.

I didn't say I was a Bolshevik; I only said if I had to choose between the Czar and—Bah! and he has the damned audacity to say he didn't snivel!

The Transport Workers' Amalgamation.

BY J. R. CAMPBELL.

We have just received a ballot paper which is being issued to the transport workers on the new amalgamation which is to unite all workers in the transport industry. An outline of the scheme is also given to the members of the unions concerned, doubtless to enable them to arrive at a just conclusion on the matter. If this is the purpose of presenting the membership with an outline of the amalgamation scheme, we cannot congratulate those who drew up the outline with making a very able attempt to achieve this purpose. The scheme is exceedingly vague, and the transport workers in voting for it are as likely to get a blank as they are to get a prize. Most recent amalgamations have been all blanks and no prizes as far as the workers are concerned, and the transport workers will have to keep wide awake or they will meet a similar fate to those other workers. It might be advisable to take a few points in the outline, and suggest that transport workers have them amended or explained.

OBJECTIVE.

Number 3 of the outlined scheme is objects. Those objects can be stated very simply. They are the organisation of transport workers and general labourers belonging to unions likely to be merged in the new amalgamation. The granting of the usual Trade Union benefits, support of the Labour Party, and the industrial objective of "the regulation of salaries, wages, hours of work, general conditions of employment"—in non-technical language, "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work." Now the slogan of a "fair day's wage for a fair day's work" may have caught the imaginations of those skilled artisans who, after the collapse of the Chartist movement, busied themselves in building up the national craft unions, but it has lost its appealing force to-day. In a world where the pre-war economic mechanism is almost at a standstill, where heavier burdens of misery are being continually placed on the backs of the long-suffering working class, such an objective is laughably irrelevant. The failure of the employing class to reconstruct the economic life of the world has made all attempts on the part of the Trade Unions to stabilise wages a manifest impossibility. Conditions are such that the workers are being continually called upon to fight to keep wages level with advancing prices, but in spite of all their efforts wages are lagging further and further behind prices. The need of the times is a new objective towards which the working class should struggle. We suggest it should be "the overthrow of Capitalism and the setting up under the shield of a working class dictatorship of a system of workers' control and management of industry." We do not suggest of course that wage struggles can be immediately abandoned, and that the workers should sit down and contemplate the good times ahead when "all will be better than well," but endeavours should be made all the time to transform the palliative struggle into a revolutionary struggle.

The objection may be advanced that there is no prospect of getting this amendment to the proposed constitution carried. Whether this is true or not, the question has got to be raised, and the active men have got to place their position frankly before the rank and file. We have got to drop the "dual personality stunt" which enables an individual to pose as a revolutionary in the branch rooms of his political party and behave as a reactionary when at his Trade Union on the plea that the workers are not advanced enough to accept his ideas. The advancement of the workers will simply be delayed if the revolutionaries continue to maintain a conspiracy of silence.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE E.C.

The governing body of the new amalgamation is to be called the General Executive Council. This body is to be composed of working members, and is to be elected on a two-fold basis. Half is to be representative of the eleven areas into which Great Britain and Ireland is to be divided and half from the national group committees. (With regard to the division of the country into eleven areas, we note that area No. 11 is Ireland. We suggest that area No. 11 ought more properly to be denominated Belfast, as there is little hope of the new union appealing to any workers outside of that area.) The idea of having each group and area represented on the

E.C. is a fairly good one, but what the average rank and file will want to know is the length of time in which a member will hold office, the frequency of the E.C. meetings, and whether the rank and file will have any power of recall. It is obvious that the power of an executive of lay members to control the executive depends upon the frequency of the E.C. meetings. An executive whose meetings are few and far between invariably fails to develop any coherent policy, except the policy of leaving everything to the paid officials. The consequence is that bureaucracy develops unchallenged, and the rank and file have about as much chance of determining the policy of their union as the natives of Timbuctoo have of influencing the League of Nations. This is a barrier to any real working class action, and if the amalgamation proposals are carried the active men in the transport industry will have to see that the rules give the executive real power, so that it will not be a hopeless body saying "Yea, yea" to any decision good, bad, or indifferent that the permanent officials may put forward.

The power of recall must also be vested in the rank and file as a safeguard against the indolence or incompetence of the elected representatives.

THE POOR OFFICIALS.

The average Trade Unionist is a kind-hearted soul, and does not like to see his officials overworked or underpaid. This is quite a laudable attitude, though it appears a trifle humorous in view of the fact that the workers who are so greatly concerned for their officials' welfare are generally underpaid themselves. But this concern can be carried to the point of absurdity, and we are afraid that the transport workers are going to be asked to display the same mistaken generosity as the workers concerned in some recent amalgamations. The proposal is that the union should take over the existing officials and meet all obligations. As far as we can judge they are taken over for life, as the only provision regarding the termination of their services reads: "Any officer becoming vacant by death or otherwise, the General Executive Council shall have the power to decide whether it is necessary to fill the vacancy or not." Now what a new union of this nature requires above all things is a supply of new men to occupy the official positions. The election of craft union Methuselahs to official positions in an up-to-date union is like appointing the captain of a fishing smack to command an up-to-date submarine. It can be done of course, but God help the crew of the submarine and God help the rank and file of the new transport union. There is no magic in herding the workers together in larger masses. The new union will be an advance on the old formations only to the extent that it adopts new tactics and policy and is in the control of men who can handle it. A great deal of valuable energy will be wasted if the new General Executive Council have to be continually waking up the slumbering officials, and we suggest that it would be cheaper and more efficient in the long run if some of the old dodderers were superannuated right away.

STRIKE POLICY.

The new union is to leave the formulation of demands to the trade and group committees covering the various sections of the union, but if a deadlock is arrived at the Group Committee has to get the sanction of the General Executive Council before a strike is declared. There is of course good reason why the various sections should formulate their demands, but when the demands of the various sections are formulated, they should be presented to the employers at the same time, and if a strike is necessary the whole union should strike. All the agreements arrived at by sections of the union should be short, and should expire at the same time so that the union at any moment will be able to move its whole forces into action. Care should be taken to see that this is embodied in the rules. It may seem to be superfluous to do this. The common sense of the proposal is so self-evident, but as many Trade Union officials and delegates were absent from parade when the rations of common sense were being served out it might be just as well to fix it in their mind by putting it in the rules, for if a Trade Union bureaucrat knows nothing else he generally knows the rules.

Rallying the Workers to Moscow. What it Means.

BY J. T. MURPHY.

Moscow or Amsterdam! Moscow or Amsterdam!! That is the issue before the organised industrial workers of the world to-day. There can be no shirking on this matter. We are either with one or the other. The problems of the day are upon us,—unemployment, wage-cutting,—compel us to action. We either treat these questions after the manner of the Amsterdam International, or we use them after the manner of the Moscow International. To say that we are neutral or that we know nothing of the Internationals, does not alter the situation. Our practice determines our position when judged from the international working-class point of view. And immediately we are conscious of the kind of practice we are making, and for what each of these internationals stand, then we are open to judgment at the bar of working-class history.

The policy of the Amsterdam International, or the "Yellows," has been revealed, and is being revealed continually, as a policy of co-operation with the enemies of the working class, culminating in a full-blown gospel of "Class Peace" and pathetic wagging at the tail of the "League of Nations."

The Policy of Moscow has also been fully revealed by the Communist International and the Russian Trade Unions in particular. Both have set the pace to the extension and development of their activities. The one in the growth of the Communist International, and the other by constant appeals to the organised industrial workers of the western countries, and by taking the initiative in the formation of the Provisional International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions, with the object of the establishment of a Red Industrial International. They have practiced a constant loyalty to the interests of the working class, have overthrown their oppressors, denounced the policy of Class Peace, and stand for a workers' International—free from a traitorous policy and traitorous leaders.

Such are the broad issues before us and upon which we must decide. But clear as these main issues may be to those who see and read, it must not be forgotten that vast multitudes who from time to time are moved in one direction or another do not see and do not understand. They move when forced by circumstances, and they move whither they do not understand. Great tasks and responsibilities are therefore thrust upon the intelligent vanguard of the masses. It is useless to deplore the movements and the protests of the workers. There they are as facts and factors of history. It is equally useless, futile and damnable to perpetually drive these masses back into the ruts of their misery, and comfort ourselves with a consciousness of their ignorance. The protests, the revolts of the masses are the sure and certain indications of the instinctive uprising of mankind against all forms of slavery.

The impulses the vanguard must encourage. The movements the vanguard must harness and direct. The ignorance and blindness the vanguard must clear away with light and education.

Three fundamental tasks therefore present themselves to the revolutionists, especially the Communists: (1) the clarification of the minds of the masses and the development of

RANK AND FILE CONTROL.

There is nothing in the outline of the new scheme about the powers of the delegate conference. This requires careful watching. The conference should have the widest possible powers in formulating the policy of the union, and it is for the rank and file to see that that power is intelligently exercised.

MAKING THE RULES.

We note that if amalgamation is carried a Provisional General Council is to be appointed to draft the new rules and submit them to a further conference. The various unofficial committees in the industry should bend every possible effort to get as many advanced men on to this body as possible, and to insist at the same time that when the new rules are drafted they shall be submitted to the rank and file for amendment, and not merely be rushed through at a conference without adequate consideration. If the rank and file rise to their responsibilities, they may make the transport workers' union a power in the land; otherwise it may become a huge bureaucratic organisation cumbering the earth and hindering the emancipation of the working class.

a consciousness in them of all that Communism means; (2) the direction of the masses in action; (3) the mobilisation of the masses for action and the conquest of power.

For the first we need an organisation of those who do understand the objective before the working class and the ways and means to get there. Such an organisation is the Communist International. For the second, the members of the Communist International must secure the will and confidence of the workers who are organised in industrial organisations. To do this they must be prepared to be members of these industrial organisations, and participate in their everyday activities, be with them in every phase of the struggle, proving to the workers that they have a working-class policy and know how to apply it.

The third task is different to the others, but of equal importance, especially as the struggle of the workers reaches



N. KROUPSKY.

its revolutionary aspects. It is the task of moving whole organisations of workers away from compromising policies, and the giving of a new orientation of policy to them. It is the rallying of the mass organisations of the workers to a new centre of gravity that will determine all their future activities. This task becomes increasingly important, as every struggle raises the revolutionary issues of the age. It is not enough simply to aim at the change of a few leaders. We have to move the whole organisation, give them an alignment with all the revolutionary forces, gather together those organisations which are determined to be loyal to the working-class interests and to fight for the workers' victory over capitalism.

That is what "Rallying the Workers to Moscow" means—a shifting away of the workers from the "Yellow" policy of bowing and scraping and appealing to the overlords who batter them for their pains, and a gravitation to the healthy heart of the revolution which stirs and pumps the life blood of purpose, courage, and power to rise from slavery to freedom.

And therefore we appeal to the organised workers in the unions to rally their organisations to Moscow. Pass the resolution of the International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions at your branch meetings. Make the pace towards the victory of the masses. Down with the compromises of the Amsterdam. **RALLY THE WORKERS' ORGANISATIONS TO THE MOSCOW CONGRESS OF 1st MAY.**

International Trade Unionism: A Summary.

(CONCLUSION)

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION SECRETARIATS.

The work and scope of the trade union internationals by industry (or International Trade Union Secretariats, as they are termed for convenience of distinction from the general International Federation of Trade Unions) are even less explored than the general I.F.T.U. Yet they represent an older and more deeply grounded movement. Twelve of them were in existence before there was any suggestion of a general Trade Union International. The regular congresses of the Miners or Textile workers show a much fuller record of continuous activity. The programme of the Miners' International has always been well in the vanguard of the International Trade Union movement. And to-day, with the formation of new and active organisations covering such important sections as agriculture, shipping and the postal services, these separate federations are more and more becoming real centres of trade union internationalism.

The earliest of these federations having a continuous existence up to the present day is the International Miners' Federation, established in 1890. There did exist as far back as 1871 an International Tobacco Workers' Federation formed on the initiation of the London Cigar Makers' Mutual Association, and including affiliations from Britain, Holland, Belgium and Germany. But there is a complete gap in the records of this association between 1872 and 1890, when it was virtually formed anew. Precedence therefore rests with the Miners' International, which was formed, on British initiative, at a Conference in the Belgian town of Jolimont, attended by 106 delegates from Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, and Austria. At this Conference an international eight-hours programme was adopted, and the International Federation formed. Since then full Congresses have been held every year right up to the war, and resumed with the Geneva Congress in 1920.

Before 1900 ten further international organisations had been formed, as follows: 1891, Woodworkers; 1892, Printers; 1893, Textile Workers, Metalworkers, Tailors, Hatters; 1894, Potters (there had been a previous International of limited scope between 1873 and 1878), Furriers; 1896, Lithographers; 1897, Transport Workers.

By 1914 there were thirty-two Trade Union Internationals in existence, of which a list will be found in the "Labour Year Book," 1916.

The war suspended relations; but immediately after the war all except four have been resumed, and of the four not resumed two (the Brewery Workers and the Butchers) have simply been absorbed into a new federation (the Food and Drink Trades Workers). Only in one case, the Transport Workers, was there a really serious and violent rupture, so that the post-war federation regards itself as a new organisation formed at the Amsterdam Conference of 1919. In addition there have been formed since the war four new Internationals, all of first-class importance: The Agricultural Workers, the Food and Drink Trades Workers, the Seamen, and the Postal Workers (the last had a pre-war international organisation, but not of a regular Trade Union character).

The present list is accordingly as follows:—

Agricultural Workers; Bakers; Bookbinders; Boot, Shoe and Leather Workers; Building Workers; Carpenters; Commercial and Clerical Employees; Diamond Workers; Factory Workers; Food and Drink Trades Workers; Furriers; Glassworkers; Hairdressers; Hatters; Hotel and Restaurant Workers; Lithographers; Metalworkers; Miners; Painters; Pavloors; Postal Workers; Pottery Workers; Printers; Saddlers; Seamen; State and Municipal Employees; Stonemasons; Tailors; Textile Workers; Tobacco Workers; Woodworkers.

Pre-War Policy.—Up to 1914 the scope of trade union internationalism was strictly limited. The holding of periodic conferences and the collection of trade statistics was the main regular function; and this meant that in the majority of cases the secretariat was the main sign of life. Now in 27 out of the 32 Internationals before the war the secretariat was situated in Germany (although two of the most important, the Miners and the Textile Workers, were centred in England). This was largely a natural reflection of the tendency of the separate organisations to cluster round the central I.F.T.U., which had its headquarters in Germany; but it was also a reflection of the apathy of other countries,

and to that extent meant that international life as a whole was weak.

Nevertheless, evidence of positive international activity may be traced along the following lines:—

(1) International financial assistance in strikes. This is common; and the Textile Workers even had a definite International Strike Fund to cover both strikes and victimisation. More usually, however, special subscriptions would be raised to meet a particular occasion.

(2) Attempts to prevent the importation of blacklegs.—The power of the Trade Unions to do this was slight; failures are frequently reported; and the only action that could be taken, as the Pottery workers were careful to specify, was "moral" action.

(3) Arrangements for transfers of members going abroad.—Such arrangements were made, among others, by the Builders and Metalworkers; the latter established a system by which members temporarily abroad should continue in benefit in the country in which they were resident.

(4) Common programmes.—Apart from the miners, the examples of this are not very numerous before the war: resolutions might be passed at the Conferences in favour of certain objects or legislation, but there are few signs of any conception of common action. The Diamond workers had a common programme with regard to apprenticeship and hours; and in 1904 the Dutch and Belgian sections carried through a joint action for a ten-hours day; but this can hardly be regarded as international. The Hotel workers, it is worth noticing, definitely declared their aim to be the establishment of a centralised international union. But the Miners were practically alone in having an elaborately worked-out international programme, which by 1913 covered a series of nine points. These points included nationalisation, the minimum wage, the eight-hours day, prohibition of the employment of women and children, and the appointment of workmen inspectors. Action against war was proposed, but agreement was not obtained.

After-War Policy.—The period after the war has witnessed a new impulse of international energy on the part of the Trade Unions, illustrated in the formation of new federations to cover industries previously untouched. National feeling against the suggestion of German control has led to other countries taking a more active part than before; and the distribution of the international centres now shows 12 in Germany, 8 in Holland, 6 in Switzerland, 3 in Belgium, 2 in England, and 1 in Austria.

A corresponding change may be observed in policy. The old types of international activity are now widely spread, and the common programmes frequent. New types have shown themselves in respect of action against war, and the demand for socialisation. Resolutions in favour of socialisation have been passed by the Miners (who have also demanded the establishment of an International Board to control coal distribution), the Food and Drink Trades workers, the Painters, and the Transport workers. The Transport workers have declared for international action against the exploitation of labour, and the employment of international systematic strikes. Resolutions in favour of international action against war on the part of affiliated Unions in the industry concerned have been passed, with varying explicitness, by the Builders, the Miners, the Postal workers, the Seamen, and the Transport workers.

"The mass-mind moves slowly, but when it does move it is like a mighty rock that through ages of decay finally loosens itself and slides down the mountain-side, crushing all that opposes it."

Read

"The Story of Robert Burns"

CIGARETTE PAPERS

By the Editor

WHO IS M. SCHWARTZ?

The Capitalist newspapers have been trumpeting the case of M. Schwartz for the last fortnight:—

"Mr and Mrs M. Schwartz, two American Socialists who attended the Moscow Congress of the Third Internationale, were thrown into prison because they disapproved of conditions in Russia. Their privations were so severe that Mrs Schwartz died after her release from prison.

He stated that Communism in Russia is robbery. It tolerates imprisonment, persecution, and execution without trial. It is a worse autocracy than the Tsaristic Government.

"I was broken-hearted with what I saw. My frank statements probably led to the arrest of myself and wife, who were thrown into separate jails. For two months we did not know what the charges were against us. I was then asked if I would make an unfavourable report to the American workers if released. I said I might forgive the wrong suffered, but was sure my wife never would. I asked to see my wife, and after long delay she entered, emaciated and miserable. She failed to recognise me. We were told we would be released, but five days elapsed before we were told we could go to the station. We were refused our baggage and 3,000 dollars in American gold.

Thrown back into prison, my wife declared a hunger strike to gain either death or liberty. We appealed to Chicherin, Trotsky, and Lenin, all of whom we personally knew, having worked in the cause for twenty years. Five days later we were sent to Reval penniless. My wife died, and I buried her there, assisted by the American Consul and Y.M.C.A. workers. A Bolshevik Minister paid me £500 at Reval, and expressed regret that we had been so badly used, pretending it was a terrible mistake."

On the face of it the story is absolutely worthless. We met Schwartz in Moscow. His wife seemed a homely kind of body, but Schwartz himself was a sly looking rascal. He exhibited a sinister curiosity concerning the real names of American delegates, and was, in fact, the identical person of whom I said we had been warned against in my article "The Reveille of Revolt." Schwartz pretended he was a member of the S.P. of America. The S.P., a non-Bolshevik party, has repudiated him. He was once an officer in the army of the Tsar, and was detained in Moscow until the Soviet Government was sure that every American had reached home. His inquisitiveness and shiftiness made every one of us suspicious, but he was as free and well cared for as anyone else. Readers will be able to attach the real value to his slanderous statements by comparing them. First of all Russian Communism is "robbery" that "imprisons and executes without trial." Although he confessed (perhaps) that he would forgive but he could swear that his wife wouldn't—the Bolsheviks made no effort to execute her. Instead they packed them off and gave them £500 to get home with. When did our gang of deporters behave so handsomely to their avowed enemies? And suppose it were quite true that the Bolsheviks were robbers and murderers—what sort of a dirty cad would you describe the man who, on being brought from prison, whines about his own forgiving nature but makes the case harder for his wife by vowing that she will never forgive. This is the sort of trick Adam played across Eve after the apple episode. "It isn't me, it is the woman."

Schwartz is a liar and a cad, and anyone who can swallow his statements is as bad as he is.

IF THE UNEMPLOYED WERE DOGS!

A fortnight ago we published a paragraph about the costly home provided by a "philanthropist" for

five puppies. Here is another item, this time from Chicago:—

"Chicago: Rex, a pet poodle, is heir to \$8,000 left by his mistress, Mrs Rose Porter, according to a will filed for probate here. The will provides that Rex be given a daily bath, plenty of Sauerkraut, and a Christmas tree each year. R. F. Jobling, of Cascade Locks, Ore., half-brother, was left \$5.00."

But they don't all live in America. Our non-producing wasters are just as bad, but they are more careful about publicity. In last Monday's "Daily Record," for example, we read:—

"With all solemnity Eric, a Persian male white cat, was buried at Scarborough on Saturday.

The animal had become such a favourite of his mistress, Miss Orr, of New Park Crescent, that she had him placed in a beautiful oak coffin, the size of a small baby's, and buried in a grave in her front garden.

An endeavour was made to keep the time of the funeral a secret, but when the undertaker arrived many people were already assembled and the windows of houses opposite were filled with people.

The grave, near a boxwood hedge, was about two feet deep, and into it was lowered the coffin of oak, with brass furnishings and silver breast-plate bearing an inscription. Pussy was decked in a shroud."

ARNOLD BENNETT'S UNKINDNESS.

The author of the "Five Towns" has been described to us as "an amazing genius," a "talented author," and in God knows how many other ways. Nowadays he is, according to the "Daily Mail," "a middle class mediocrity," and to the "Sunday Times" the revelation of his latest book "is not that of a genius." Why the sudden change, reader? Just because Arnold has been telling the truth—the plain unvarnished truth. In his latest book, which we haven't read, but which we are going to read, he tells of little incidents or "things which have interested me" that the smug, self-satisfied, pot-bellied bourgeois thought were forgotten. That's his crime. He drags the mouldy skeletons of bourgeois culture out of the cupboard and rattles the bones to everybody's discomfort. One of his reviewers ("Sunday Times") says:—

"Mr Bennett has a healthy dislike of generals and staff officers, and all the paraphernalia which gilds the higher command. He relates little stories about them with malicious relish, and shares the opinion of the younger subaltern that nothing quite so stupid has ever been conceived as the average general complete with red tabs."

And these mountains of stupidity are frequently known as "Competent Military Authorities." We shall always treasure the recollection we have of being privileged to tell three of them to go to hell during the great war—and one of them at least did so. To return to our critic:—

"Nothing can be quite so bitter as his attack on the British attitude, which encouraged hatred of Germany to such a degree that the woman who gave a German prisoner cigarettes and a sixpence was fined by a Bench of intelligent magistrates three hundred times the size of her gift. 'Why,' he asked, 'was she not sentenced to penal servitude for life?' The woman's son had fought for us at Jutland, and she had only given sixpence to a German prisoner! Mr Bennett is not very kind when he reminds us of our organised hatred."

How nice it is to find a highly respectable bourgeois paper admitting that the war hatred was "organised." And here is a nice tit-bit:—

"Mr Bennett is forced to the conclusion that he has never heard an intelligent political discussion in English in a foreign hotel, but he gilds the pill by illustrating the British attitude in hotels on social questions, with the remark of a beautiful and elegant tennis-playing girl at Cannes, apropos of a miners' strike: 'They ought to be forced down the pits and made to work.'"

But that is the orthodox attitude of most bourgeois women. For sheer brutality of spirit they can beat the men hollow. We are reminded of a passage in Miss Muriel Buchanan's book on Revolutionary Petrograd, wherein this young lady and daughter of the British Ambassador shows the ferocity of the bourgeois feminine nature:—

"Kerensky and the Government let the propitious moment pass. The Kronstadt sailors, taken prisoners in the fortress, were set at liberty instead of being shot as traitors. . . . 'We must shed no blood!' said Kerensky, the idealist in him once more overcoming the statesman and ruler, hesitating to strike a blow at the insidious evil of Bolshevism." No, reader, there'll be damned little mercy to expect from Mrs Snowden's "tenderly nurtured ladies" when the fight is over, if their side wins.

HUMOUR OF THE WEEK.

Mr Victor Fisher, one time Freethinker and Social Democrat, has been discoursing for the Christian Counter Communist Society, a movement out to fight Bolshevism. Victor was always a bit of a fathead, but now he appears to have gone over the top entirely. Hist!—

"In the ranks of Labour the dangerous factors were not so much the Cramps and the Smillies as men of the 'Jimmy' Thomas type, who required to be carefully watched."

"Watched" by the Government, mind, not by the workers.

From Saturday's "Daily Record":—

"According to wiseacres on the other side of the Atlantic, it is probable that if the Prince of Wales ascends the British throne 'he will rule under the title of King David I.' Our American cousins declare that Queen Victoria was known to prophesy that a King David, who would be a great and powerful monarch, would one day reign over our Empire."

The only comment we can make is Jesus Christ!

Princess Helena Victoria was present at a performance of "The Mollusc" on Wednesday night last. Many of the upper class molluscs were also in attendance. Appropriately enough the most important part was played by a Mrs Leech. Some of the barnacles of society occupied boxes and stalls.

In last week's "Forward" by Philip Snowden:—

"Therefore, always try to make Socialism as repulsive as possible by preaching hate, malice, and all charitableness."

The hate and malice of course towards Soviet Russia, and the all charitableness towards the I.L.P.

ORDER NOW.

THE STORY OF ROBERT BURNS.

By JOHN S. CLARKE.

Single Copies, 3d. 13 Copies, 2/6. Special terms for one hundred.

Workshop Notes.

NATIONAL AMALGAMATED FURNISHING TRADES ASSOCIATION.

Will all members of above who are in sympathy with the Workers' Committee movement send in their name and address with occupation and number of Branch to J. Messer, "Worker" Office, 31 N. Frederick Street, Glasgow.

BABCOCKS.

It is some little time since we had occasion to deal with this plant. This has led some of the individuals whom we have had occasion to rap over the knuckles in the past to believe that they are secure, and they are drifting back into their evil ways again. This is particularly the case with the marine shop, where the "Bummer" and his satellite, the authority on Burns ("Who was a coward slave") keep watch over the comings and goings of the rascal multitude. Recently there was a quarrel in this shop between a wee gaffer and a workman over who would get using a crane. The wee gaffer hit the workman, but, alas, the workman was a physical force Communist, and the wee gaffer's face soon resembled a raw beef steak. The "Bummer" was called to sack the workman, and nearly had a fit when he saw the disfigured countenance of the wee gaffer. He sent for reinforcements, and the Burns authority arrived on the scene and supported the "Bummer." The 'tocs were then sent for, and the unruly Communist was escorted to the gates. We hear that, as a consequence of this episode, Babcocks are starting special physical culture classes for gaffers, with boxing a speciality.

THE COMMUNISTS IN FIFE.

We have always held that a Communist Party's efficiency must be judged by the influence that it is able to wield amongst the non-Communists. The Communist must accept responsibility in all the mass organisations of the working class, and be prepared to give the masses a lead at any time. We note that in the recent voting in connection with the Fife Miners' Union the Communist Labour Party has had two of its members elected to the position of president and secretary of that body. Stewart, C.L.P., has unseated Greenhorn, the former president, a fervent supporter of "Wullie" Adamson, who has held the position for fourteen years. The voting was—Stewart, 514; Greenhorn, 354. The secretary, Stehhouse, gives way to Gourdie, C.L.P. This is a good start, but the Communists must not relax their efforts until complete control of all organisations in the area is obtained.

DON'T TRUST THE BOSS.

Some time ago members of the shop committee in the Albion were discussing unemployment, and it was decided to pass on the "Hands off Russia" Committee leaflet on the contract received from Soviet Russia by the American Vanderlip, in order to show the management that if they could not get contracts for motor cars, there were some people who could. Some days later the manager said that he had read the leaflet, which was quite a good one, and the firm was now writing the employers' federation asking them to bring pressure on the Government and get trade opened with Russia as soon as possible. Rebels in the Albion, however, are taking those promises with a pinch of salt. They recognise that the power which is going to force recognition of Russia is the working class, and until the workers get control of industry and government, security of employment cannot possibly be guaranteed.

TRADE UNION LEADERS PAY SUPER-TAX.

The Sheffield Division of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation has just been holding its half-yearly meeting, and the poor, dear officials have been having a rough passage. It is obvious that there are some rank-and-filers who do not love their officials, and who have even suggested

that their wages are too high when compared with the work they do. The formation of a union of trade union officials, as suggested recently, comes not a moment too soon, as certain disgruntled individuals are out to rob the higher officials of their comfy little villas, and give them a wage which will force them to live in working-class conditions and rub shoulders with the proletariat, out of which they have just raised themselves. It appears from the report that Mr. John Hodge is getting the paltry sum of £2,888 for his exertions in looking after the union, and in advocating increased production. The objection to salaries of this kind being paid union officials is quite a valid one. Such a salary raises a man into a middle-class environment, where he acquires a middle-class outlook. If he is at all thrifty and invests part of his money he becomes a small capitalist, with investments spread throughout industry. The idea that such an individual will be prepared to lead the workers to victory over their exploiters is chimerical. Indeed, it is questionable if such a problem exists in his mind at all. All his time is taken up holding the workers back from action and preaching harmony between capital and labour.

In his defence Mr. Hodge spat out the following great thought:—"I ought not to be paid less than any man in the trade. You have men in the iron and steel trade earning even more money than I have. That is the point of view I want you to realise." Well, there may be men in the iron and steel trade earning £56 per week, but, by God, they are few and far between. The idea that because a few men in exceptional positions in a certain trade earn sums five, six, or seven times greater than the ordinary rank-and-filer, that, therefore, the trade union official who is not working at the trade should have wages equal to theirs, is preposterous. If there are men in the iron and steel trade earning wages equal to Mr. Hodge they are doing so because of their exceptional usefulness to the boss. When Hodge shows the same usefulness to the working class he might get the same salary, but in the meantime we advise the rank and file of the Confederation to get Hodge out of the Confederation, and get him into the industry where the bosses are so lavishly throwing away money for nothing.

John also had a pitiful wail about the sad fate of Mr. Brace, who had departed from the Labour movement to seek more profitable spheres of exploitation elsewhere. In the midst of his lamentation John was interrupted by a voice. The owner of the voice was obviously a rough, uncultivated person who is incapable of appreciating the tragic loss which the Labour movement has suffered by Mr. Brace openly accepting service under the class whose interests he has defended whenever possible during the last twenty-five years. The irreverent voice said "he (Mr. Brace) had been a capitalist for some time," whereat the nimble-witted John retorted "We are all capitalists more or less." When you awake in the morning and throw up your window and breathe in the pure unsullied air of Brightside do not curse your fate; remember "we are all capitalists more or less." If you are a Scot or a transplanted supporter of King Carson just look out of your window at Coatbridge, and when your eyes pierce the smoke-screen and you discern "as in a dream faintly" the industrial paradise in which you toil, take a deep breath, knit your brows, and repeat a hundred times "We are all capitalists more or less." That will infallibly cure you of any evil feelings against the boss which you may hold, and if when entering the paradise you learn that the worker is closing down, bear your responsibility "like a capitalist more or less."

After John had put up a defence he was supported by Mr. Dodgson (Divisional Organiser). He, also, had a slap at the evil-minded workers. "If an official was seen riding in an employer's motor car, he was riding at the expense of the workers." Seeing the motor was bought out of the profits wrung from the workers this is quite accurate economics, however much it may ruffle Mr. Dodgson's feelings. If the boss gives a

trade union official a joy-ride in his Rolls-Royce it is not because he loves the official, but because he hopes to wrangle him in the interests of the employing class.

Dodgson then went on to state that the organiser who champions the case of the employer in the Sheffield area has an income running at four figures, and that he and his colleagues were quite as good men as the barrister. There's beautiful mentality for you. The bosses, out of their hundreds of thousands, can pay a barrister an income of four figures, why not the workers out of their pittance. The argument is that a capitalist-minded money-grubber, and although the resolution to review the officials' salaries was defeated by forty-five votes to twenty-one, the rank and file of the Labour movement will have to make a clean sweep of this parasitism sooner or later, or the Labour movement will soon be rotten and useless through this disease.

APPRENTICES.

One of the weakest links in the Trade Union movement is the apprentice question. Apart from the restriction of apprentices the Trade Unions take little or no interest in the apprentices. The result is that the master class means of welfare clubs, etc., get hold of the young workers in their most impressionable years and so educate to suit their own interests. At the present time the joiners on the Clyde are on strike, whereas the apprentices are carrying on production where the men left off. The shipwrights have rejected piecework, yet they make no attempt to organise the apprentices, who are therefore working piecework. Thus the master class gain their object. What is one generation to the ruling class? The capitalist class can afford to give way to one generation if the workers will allow them to "educate" their successors. What the workers must do is to organise the boy as soon as he enters the workshop. If the machinery of your craft cannot enlist him then set about organising the young into club educational classes, etc., recruiting grounds for your industrial unions. The time is arriving when we will require all our forces, and a powerful factor for the revolution will be the young element of the working class.

Mustard.

Snowden, who has been dumped from the "Labour Leader," insinuates himself into the "Forward." He waxes sarcastic in a series of paragraphs for propagandists. Here is one of them—

"Personal appearance is of some importance in a propagandist. So take good care to be always unkempt. Such an appearance so harmonises with talk about art and beauty under Socialism."

As old Bill Shakespeare puts it, that's "a bit of a very palpable hit" at someone not a hundred miles from Buchanan Street.

And in the same issue Macdonald—he ups and delivers himself of this:—

"The Communists outside of Russia are without the Right."

So far as I am concerned, I am on the Left and shall remain on the Left."

Well, well; is he one of the "gallus" fellows? Shinwell had so much to say about in the Metropole theatre?

But, Right or Left, Macdonald is a "gentleman" and will not tolerate anything unseemly. Here is how he spreads himself out about Macnamara.

"What is wanted is fight, and what must be remembered is that the man who shakes his fist at a chairman and yells at a speaker like a bellman in a storm is not a fighter but a mere brawler. Men fight when they go out to say what they think and say it in an uncompromising way, but in an effectively manly one. The Chairman of the Edinburgh Trades Council who showed that Dr. Macnamara was prevaricating and told him that they had no votes of thanks to give him, was far more effective than the Aberdeen interrupters."

was perhaps rude, but a dignified rudeness has all the effectiveness of good manners combined with righteous indignation."

Now, let it be understood that the man who shook his fist at the chairman, and who, according to the "gentlemanly" Mac, is a mere "brawler," is a member of the I.L.P.; and Macdonald was damned glad to have the use of the same fist when he was being attacked in Aberdeen during the war. It was the "brawler," and such as he, who made it possible for Macdonald to have a meeting anywhere, by interposing their bodies between him and the hooligan patriots. And now he repays them with his "gentlemanly" sneer. The cad!

We just about had a display of fireworks at Glasgow Town Council meeting last Thursday. Wheatley's soothing syrup was served up just in time.

The police had surrounded the buildings, and some of the Council members were indignant, and demanded their withdrawal.

One Councillor, with a tender conscience, perhaps, complained that a policeman looked at him. We wonder what he has been up to.

When things were at their worst the Lord Provost threatened to adjourn the meeting, and we leave the "Times" to tell the rest:—

"Thereupon Mr Kirkwood sprang to his feet and cried—If you adjourn we will carry on.

The Lord Provost—The minutes are before you. Is it your desire to carry on the business in the ordinary way? We are here at a sacrifice of time to do the work. Some say that this is organised obstruction. I do not think so. I ask you to carry on the business.

Mr John Stewart—Are you prepared to withdraw the police from the buildings?

Mr Wheatley suggested that they proceed with the business. They had made a vigorous protest, —a justifiable protest,—but he thought they should now get on with the work.

This appeal had a soothing effect."

Which is another way of rendering intelligible the ancient classic—"When daddy says turn we all turn."

Glasgow Communist Group,
Burnbank Gardens.

READY SHORTLY

"The Red Commune"

FULL PARTICULARS NEXT WEEK

Mrs Gazippe—"I'm rather hard to please. Have you had much experience as a maid?"

The Applicant—"I've worked for the Duke and Duchess of St. Stephen's for six months before they separated."

Mrs Gazippe—"I'll engage you. Now tell me all about it."

✧ ✧ ✧

Wherever there is a capitalist who grasps a part of the meaning of Socialism, there is a capitalist who fears. He thinks that shrewdness is wisdom and that force power, and, moved by the lever of fear, he first tries to fight philosophy with sophistry, and to oppose science with cunning. Worst of in the test by argument, his fear grows greater. Then his craven heart comes to the relief of his crafty mind—they are always together. Craft tells him he cannot win by reason. Cowardice tells him he may win by force. Fear eats him like an acid.

Correspondence.

DUMFRIES HOSIERY WORKERS.

Dear Sir,—I am in communication with Alec Bayne regarding the proposed discussion on this question, so little more requires to be said in the columns of the "Worker."

It may, however, interest your readers to know that on the 8th Jan., the date of your issue in which Bayne and Day were insinuating that neither dispute nor unemployment benefit was being paid to Dumfries workers, I was in Dumfries paying out £1,000 benefit payments.

This was as it should be: the members had joined the union for these benefits and they were paid, but your correspondents rushed into print giving the impression that the workers were not being recognised.

With regard to the original points in Bayne's letter I can only add that his letter of the 15th January simply proves that the man does not understand the points at issue in Dumfries.

The employers, taking advantage of dull trade, intimated a reduction of 15 per cent. on wages. I advised resistance: the question at issue with the workers was what sort of resistance should they make.

It was common knowledge that employers were slack and that a month's strike would not make them turn a hair.

I advised that the workers refuse to accept reduction, but take advantage of Section 7 (b) of Unemployment Act, 1920, and claim unemployment benefit. This Section says, in so many words:—A worker will not be deemed to have failed to fulfil the statutory regulations if he refuses to accept a situation at a less rate of wages than he previously earned in the district."

This Section would give the workers unemployment benefit while he was resisting a reduction. The Employment Exchange Referee Court turned down this claim, in my view wrongly, but they turned the claim down (it is presently before the Umpire). This left the workers to resist a reduction on an unemployed market on strike pay.

Bayne, however, cannot or will not see what was done, and he continues to blather about trade union leaders giving wrong advice. His attitude is too funny for words. Has he not sufficient imagination to grasp that the attitude taken up, if I could have got the exchange referees to take my view, would have been a jolly good stunt for the workers. Oh, says Bayne, you should be sure of your ground before you give advice. I agree; but I am going to advise fighting reductions in wages by any and every means in my power, whether I carry the reactionaries with me or not. Bayne cannot hunt with the hare and run with the hounds. In his first letter he accuses trade union officials with not fighting, and in his second letter he turns round and says before a trade union official moves he should be certain of strike or unemployment pay. I was always under the impression that it was the fight that mattered. Is it not true that Bayne and his friends were going around Dumfries saying the workers would never resist the reductions, "the union would never get them to stop," and when the workers did resist the reduction, and the union got the workers to stop, then he trots around saying—Oh, damn these unions; they should have done some other thing.

If Bayne would help, and not snarl, there is plenty of work waiting.—Yours, etc.,

R. CLIMIE.

This correspondence is now closed.—Editor.

... MOULDERS AND STEEL DRESSERS.

Dear Comrade,—It was with feelings of the greatest possible pleasure that I learned from your Workshop Notes in a recent issue of the "fighting spirit" of the Springfield (commonly known as the "Pancake") moulders. Yea, verily, it must have been a great awakening. But it is very unfortunate that this revolutionary spirit can only be called to the surface when their own individual interests seem to be menaced. I hate to use the expression, but if ever men (?) proved themselves traitors to their own class (their own shopmates) the aforesaid moulders have done so.

The moulders of Scotland have, by an overwhelming majority, repudiated payment by results, but it will surprise your readers to know that the "Pancake" moulders stood by whilst the steel dressers fought this issue in that particular shop, and have been defeated. That despicable type of man, "the scab," has entered the shop, and the dressers have been "out" for the last twelve months. The moulders are making castings for scab dressers, and yet the fact remains that if these disciples of "direct action" had taken action on the occasion of the dressers' dispute the shop would still be manned by trade union labour. Of course, the position of a moulder who was not "paid up" and, consequently, was in grave danger of being minus his "bottle and bun" on Hogmanay, was a thousand times more important than the mere starvation of a few low-down dressers. At least, so some of the boys in Springfield think. I admit that there may be some good men in Springfield, but in view of the facts I have given they must be in a very small minority. Or, is it possible it is not yet too late? Can a fight yet be made on this issue? I hope our comrade will use his energies in this direction, and wipe out one of the blackest spots in the history of the Glasgow foundry trades.—Yours, etc.,

EDWARD CLARKE.

FIFE MINERS.

Dear Comrade,—The following is a sample of how the business of our local branches of the Fife Miners' Union is conducted. A meeting was billed for Tuesday last week for the purpose of getting the delegates' monthly report of the Executive Board meeting, held in Dunfermline, and the agenda of business for the next board meeting was to be discussed. There turned up at the meeting about a dozen members altogether, including the officials minus the Secretary. After the delegate had gone over the monthly report like a racehorse, which contained nothing worth mentioning (what it did contain could have been settled by pit committees, if we had had them), and the agenda of business for next month. A few of us Communists put forward a resolution to the effect that this branch calls upon the B.M.F. to send delegates to Moscow on May 1st to represent the British miners at the World's Congress of the Red Revolutionary Labour Unions. The chairman, who, by the way, was not the ordinary chairman, he having left to go for a shave, said:—"I don't think anybody will have any objection to the resolution, in fact, I expect the B.M.F. will be sending delegates to Moscow." (Smiles from the Communists.) We got a seconder. The local delegate moved an amendment that the B.M.F. don't send delegates, as he did not believe in revolution nor the dictatorship of any body of men, no matter what they professed to be. He said that what he wanted was the rank and file to use the ballot box and put in the right man, and try a majority of Labour men in Parliament, and if the capitalists did not accept the situation then the call for a general strike should go forth in order to force the bosses to get out. Of course, we tried to show him where he was contradicting himself, but all to no purpose. The resolution was defeated. I have written this in order to show the rank and file the type of men we have in most of our local bodies. They have the damned cheek to try and say that Lenin is wrong and they are right. I often wish I had the power to wither their miserable carcasses with a glance. I would do it. Now, it lies with the Fife miners next month to shift those men, and see that they place men in the positions who are not afraid to fight, and fight every inch of the way, for the uplifting of our fellow-miners. Get your constitution changed. Get your pit committees set up. Fling out all the belly-crawling, sneaking lick-spittles that compose the present Miners' Union and get on with the fight.—Yours, etc.,

ROBERT BEVERIDGE.

J. CLINTON PLEASE NOTE.

Dear Comrade,—In Workshop Notes of several weeks back was a letter from J. Clinton, Dundee, on the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives.

I am a member of Kilmarnock Branch, and

should like to get into touch with Comrade Clinton, as the position of the boot and shoe industry seems to be no better there than here. Yours, etc.,

THOS. CAMPBELL.

SHINWELL, TERRORISM, AND "FORWARD."

Dear Comrade,—The accompanying letter was sent by me to "Forward," but was so mutilated when it appeared that I hardly recognised it. I shall be glad, therefore, if you will give it publicity in your columns.—Yours fraternally,

J. MAIN.

Editor of "Forward."

Dear Sir,—

E. SHINWELL AND TERRORISM.

For a considerable period now I have been reading your paper, and have noticed the efforts of certain contributors and members of the movement, particularly E. Shinwell, to write and speak disparagingly of the Third International.

On many occasions this individual has expressed horror and indignation at the tactics pursued by the supporters of the Third, and would lead many to believe that he was a constitutionalist, and would never institute or propagate the institution of measures involving terrorism. I would never have opened up this correspondence but for reading the report of the debate on the Third International at the Scots' I.L.P. Conference, which appeared in your issue of January 15th. Therein we find J. B. Payne (Aberdeen) defending the Third, and in reply to Shinwell he stated that:—It was rather late in the day—Shinwell had "asked" for it, and he was going to get it—for Shinwell to advocate constitutional action in view of his speech to the I.L.P. at Kilmarnock, where he had said that Keir Hardie had died of a broken heart, but that the young men of the I.L.P. would die of broken heads. In an industrial dispute, too, Shinwell had advocated unconstitutional action." And:—"At this point both Shinwell and another delegate, who said he had been a member of the particular strike committee concerned, rose and denied a statement made by Payne."

Now, I do not know what strike Payne is referring to, but what I do know is that during the forty hours' strike he (Shinwell) did advocate action that was not only unconstitutional, but, by the supporters of the Third, would be considered criminal folly, and likely to discredit the whole movement. I ask E. Shinwell to carry his memory back to the afternoon of "Bloody Friday" and recollect what he said in the presence of myself and one or two other comrades. It is not my intention meantime to give publicity to the utterances of Shinwell on that eventful day, but merely to support the statement of J. B. Payne, and, at the same time, let other comrades know what type of an individual the former is. Listening to him in public and reading some of his articles one is apt to conclude that he is one of those "peaceful loving citizens," a disciple of Tolstoi, who abhors the very idea of militantly defending one's principles.

Many comrades are sick almost to death hearing the cant and hypocrisy as expressed in his denunciation of the Third International, knowing that he is prepared to adopt any form of tactics, including violence, etc. I think it is time the working class knew, at least that intelligent section who advocate the abolition of Capitalism, where Shinwell stands in relation to methods and tactics involved in the march to our emancipation. To support one thing in public and another thing in private, and thus creating false impressions, is not, in my opinion, "playing the game." Neither is his references to the conditions of the Third International involving "civil war." Yet Shinwell and others note that the adherents of the Third do not advocate the adoption of measures of a dictatorial nature which is likely to result in armed conflict of a small or large character, because they believe in "civil war" as a means to end the exploitation of man by man. But because they know historical necessity will compel them to ruthlessly destroy the power of

the bourgeoisie, who, in the determination to maintain their rule, will plan and plot secretly, not only to crush the revolution, but to murder the revolutionaries at the same time. I think in this brief note I have written sufficient in support of J. B. Payne's contention, and if Shinwell considers it necessary I am quite prepared to remind him of the terroristic methods he was prepared to support during the forty hours' strike.—Yours, etc.,

JAS. MAIN.

W. PAUL'S VISIT TO RUSSIA.

Dear Sir,—Before leaving here on Monday Wm. Paul asked me to send a letter to Scotland Yard and let you have a copy of it for use in "The Worker." It ran as follows:—

"Coatbridge Branch Comm. Party of Great Britain

"Messrs. Scotland House, Westminster.

"Sirs,—At a meeting held in the Town Hall here last night to hear a report from Mr. Wm. Paul regarding the position of affairs in Russia, Mr. Paul stated that he had been detained at Folkestone, and papers, photos, and literature had been taken possession of by Scotland Yard officers. This gentleman was expressly delegated by a section of the Trade Union movement to collect and bring back to them accurate information of the development in Russia, and very strong indignation was expressed at the official action interfering with that object. The following resolution was moved, seconded, and unanimously adopted by the meeting:—'This meeting of organised workers emphatically protests against the detention of Mr. Wm. Paul at Folkestone by Scotland Yard. It demands the immediate return of all papers, photos, and literature collected by him in Russia.' I have been instructed to forward this communication to you.—

"WM. MEWAN, Secy."

MCLEAN AND REVOLUTION.

Comrade,—I was interested to hear Neil Maclean's reply to W. Gallacher. The sentence that struck me most was:—"It is quite evident that more careful consideration requires to be given to the whole revolutionary position, and during that period it will be better for all parties to suspend recriminations." And, sure, it made me blink. When did Neil Maclean return to the revolutionary ranks?

On the occasion of his last visit to Dumfries he was of a rather tame "parliamentary" frame of mind.

When in conversation with Neil Maclean and a prominent local I.L.P. I spoke of the Workers' Committee movement as a means of achieving revolution. Alas, I was in bad repute, as I was ever giving voice to the need for organising for industrial action. I suffered, and still suffer, from the "infantile sickness," i.e., disbelief in the efficacy of the Parliamentary machine as a weapon for the destruction of Capitalism; and the local I.L.P. crowd who had, and have, their minds fixed on, and in, the ballot-box, did not believe that such disbelief should be allowed to have expression. Anyway, when I introduced Workers' Committee idea our local comrade said: "Oh, give us a rest. We hear that often enough." But the subject evidently perturbed Mr. Maclean, and he, with some emphasis, remarked:—"There's too much talk of workshop action. That idea needs to be killed," and proceeded to show the need for Parliamentarianism, and also that the leaders could not go forward because of the apathy of the rank and file. I wonder if he is of same opinion yet? If he thinks industrial action cannot achieve revolution, or if Parliamentary methods will? And if, after the miners' strike, he is not convinced that it is the leaders who are apathetic?

Of course, the conversation referred to was a "private" one, and occurred about fifteen months ago. I have yet to learn that Neil Maclean is not still out to kill the idea of industrial action for revolutionary purposes.—Yours, etc.,

ALEC. BAYNE.

COMMUNIST LABOUR PARTY (Paisley Branch).

A LANTERN LECTURE on ROBERT BURNS
will be held in the
Central Halls on Monday, January 31, at 7.45 p.m.
Speaker—J. C. CLARKE.
Silver Collection.

COMMUNIST LABOUR PARTY (Anderston Branch).

Sunday First at 6.45 p.m., in Socialist Hall,
659 Argyle Street.
Speaker—JOHN DAVIES.
Subject—
"The Implications of Communist Thought."
Solos. Questions. Discussion.

GLASGOW AND DISTRICT MAY-DAY COMMITTEE, 1921.

The first Meeting of the Delegates will be held on Saturday, 29th January, 1921, at 3 p.m., in the Tinsplate Workers' Hall, 9 Watson Street (near Glasgow Cross). All Delegates are requested to attend, as there is Business of Importance.

If any organisation has not received an invitation to send Delegate, write at once for full information to the Secy., JOHN M'DOUGALL, 228 Crookston Street, Glasgow, S.S.

The Employers are United. Why not the Workers?

GALE'S

International Monthly of Revolutionary
Communism.

\$2 (DOLLARS) A YEAR.

Remit by New York bank draft, payable to Linn A. E. Gale—in no other way. Address—

GALE'S,

P.O. Box 518, Mexico City, D.F., Mexico.

What about the Maintenance Fund? . . .



After the Burns' Supper.

Printed by Kirkwood & Co., 127 Stockwell Street,
Glasgow, and published by the Scottish
Workers' Committee, 31 North Frederick St.,
Glasgow. J. M. Messer, Secy.