

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

For International Socialism

VOL. VI.—No. 26.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20th, 1919.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

GLASGOW: THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

A NEW LANDMARK.

The Trade Union Congress of Glasgow is the most important ever held, because it has laid down that Conference decisions must be followed by action.

It has censured the Executive for ignoring the demand of the Triple Alliance and the Southport Labour Party Congress for the calling of a special Conference to decide what action, if any, shall be taken to stop the capitalist intervention in Russia and to abolish conscription.

It has decided that the Parliamentary Committee shall again call upon the Government to repeal the Conscription Acts and withdraw the troops from Russia; should the Government refuse, the Conference insists that a Trade Union Congress shall be called immediately to decide what action shall be taken.

The sense of the Conference was emphatically that intervention of any kind in Russia must cease. The resolution merely states that the British troops must be withdrawn, and does not mention the munitions and other aid sent to Denikin, Koltchak, and other counter-revolutionaries. This is a point that must be carefully watched.

Brotherton, of the A.S.E., raised it, but did not press home his point so as to get the wording of the resolution changed. Should the Parliamentary Committee adhere strictly to the terms of the resolution in conveying the message of Congress, the Government will probably reply by withdrawing British troops for a time, without checking in the least the stream of munitions and other supplies which it is sending to the counter-revolutionaries. Should the Parliamentary Committee refrain from calling the Conference under such circumstances, the intention of the Conference would be frustrated. We hope the Parliamentary Committee will not lend itself willingly to such trickery, but the Government cannot be trusted, and such loopholes are regrettable.

The Conference rejected the Government scheme for trustifying the mines, demanded the enactment of the Sankey Report, and in the event of another Government refusal, decided to call a Conference to adopt action to compel assent. We regret that the miners have not chosen to make their fight on a better scheme than that of Sankey.

The Direct Action policy has made great headway, but, when the question was directly raised, the Conference buried the issue by carrying a motion for the previous question.

The Conference demanded the recognition of the Police Union.

The miners are the driving force in the Congress, because the young people with the new ideas, the rank and file who are still working in the pits, are gaining control of the Miners' Federation. But the young blood has by no means found its way on to the Parliamentary Committee. Though Havelock Wilson has been defeated, Colonel Will Thorne was second on the poll, and those hardened reactionaries, W. J. Davis and J. Sexton, still remain. In the Conference itself grey beards and bald crowns predominated; the majority of the delegates were decidedly middle-aged. There is a very firm official crust for the seething aspirations of the oppressed to break

through, but the crust is cracking in many directions, and the smaller officials are being driven onward by a current entirely opposite to that which made them howl for victory and the Empire during the first half of the war.

Councillor Shinwell, only released from prison a fortnight before, conveyed the greetings of the Glasgow movement to the Congress. It is said that officialdom had raised some objections to Shinwell performing this function, but he received a tremendous ovation, during which the Chairman intervened with a stiff "Order, order! It is a strict rule of Trade Union Congresses that there shall be no applause from the gallery." This rule is honoured rather in the breach than in the observance, and during the remainder of the Conference the visitors applauded as they chose and without rebuke. We hope that the Glasgow precedent of omitting the address of welcome by the Mayor, who usually represents a capitalist party, will be followed by all Labour Conferences.

INCREASED PRODUCTION.

WHO SENT BROWNIE'S LETTER TO THE PRESS?

In the discussion on the Parliamentary Committee's report the paragraph on the Coal Commission was the signal for J. T. Brownlie to drag in the subject of increased production, which, by his method of linking the two questions together, he used to make an indirect attack on the miners' claim for the nationalisation of their industry. He declared that the engineering trade, which he represented, could not exist without cheap motive power, and that it had been said that owing to the increased wages and reduced hours of British miners, manufacturers could save money by importing coal from China instead of buying it here. He repudiated the charge that he had called the workers slackers, but added that they are not devoid of responsibility, and declaimed vehemently against capitalism.

J. Mills, of Woolwich, informed the Conference that the A.S.E. repudiates Brownlie's letter, and that Brownlie had assured the A.S.E. delegates he had not meant the letter for the Press. The Chairman declared that the Parliamentary Committee was not responsible for publishing the letter; indeed it had only reached the Committee on the morning it appeared in the newspapers.

Who, then, is responsible? Does the Post Office open Mr. Bowerman's letters and send their contents to the newspapers? Surely not!

Ben Turner observed that the only demand for increased production came from the profiteers who led the nation into war. The rate of production in the textile mills per man and per woman had increased since the war ended. Amid tremendous enthusiasm, he cried: "Mr. Brownlie, I don't like your pals and associates. If you want to prevent national bankruptcy, stop this Russian madness. I don't see a Labour Government coming as soon as some people profess to see it. But I hope it is coming, for the nation wants saving, and only the working people can do it."

Havelock Wilson then spoke, not to that Congress, but through the reporters, to an out-

side public, which, unawakened to the class-struggle, is groping uncertainly for a policy.

"Outside amongst the millions of workers you claim to represent," he said, "Brownlie's letter stands out as a courageous document." He demanded from the working class more "hard work": he had not been able to find any "West End idlers."

Next day, Havelock Wilson, appealing to hostile delegates for a quiet hearing in order that his message might find its way uninterrupted into the masters' press, opposed the miners' demand for the nationalisation of the mines and asserted the superiority of private capitalism. His speech drew from Smillie the retort that Wilson, as a member of the Parliamentary Committee of the Congress, had been appointed to press its findings upon the legislature. Smillie complained that Wilson as a member of the P.C. had come before the Coal Commission to give evidence against those findings. The miners had had to appeal to Mr. Bowerman to give evidence, in order to prove where the Congress really stood. As evidence to the value of private enterprise, Wilson had told a story about a Yorkshireman who spent half-a-million pounds in digging a pit in the hope of finding coal. "People don't sink a pit to find if there's coal down there," said Smillie. "They usually bore."

Congress replied to Havelock Wilson's advocacy of the case for Capitalism by ejecting him from the Parliamentary Committee by an enormous majority.

THE MINERS' CLAIM.

Smillie, by far the most popular figure in the Congress and always received with cheers, pointed out that since 1882 successive Congresses had passed 42 resolutions for nationalising the mines. Under private management 1,240 miners, nearly 4 a day, are killed on the average annually, whilst 6½ million miners have been injured during the last 20 years. It was not too much to claim that the men and women employed in the mining industry should have as much voice in the industry as those who invested their money in it. He showed that his policy is developing, by observing that whilst there is nothing of Syndicalism in the miners' present demand, that will come at a later stage. The largest output, he contended, will never be secured from privately-owned mines; millions of tons of coal, which is exhaustible, are wasted under private ownership. Prior to the setting up of the Coal Commission the miners, by 6 or 7 to 1, had voted to strike to secure nationalisation. The Coal Commission had been reluctantly agreed to, on condition that half the seats should be allotted to Labour representatives. The miners had not been satisfied with the majority report of the Commission; Hodges and he had a hard task to induce their delegates to accept it; nevertheless the Government had rejected the findings of its own Commission. No one was more fully aware of the sufferings caused by a strike than he, but his experience led him to know that times arise when it is a crime for Trade Union leaders to advise anything but a strike. The knowledge that a long strike would bring hardship into tens of thousands of homes outside the mining industry made the miners specially anxious to carry agreement with their claims throughout

(Continued on next page)

the trade union movement. Within a month the miners would stop every mine in the country should the Government refuse their claim. This statement is important: it should mean that Smillie and the miners will follow words by action. The logical outcome of the miners' resolution is undoubtedly "down tools" if the Government refuse. Nevertheless the resolution was supported by three persistent opponents of direct action—J. H. Thomas, Tom Shaw, and W. Brace.

The opening words of Thomas would have suggested that he is veering round on this question, but for his emphatic repudiation of direct action during the Russia-Conscription debate. He said:

"Smillie called this a moderate resolution. Let there be no mistake; whilst for 3 years Congress has passed similar resolutions, it must not be assumed that the result of this resolution will be a mere repetition. I am under no misapprehension: let Congress, before it votes for the resolution, realise all that is expected from it."

Thomas was surely indicating that a strike is likely to follow. Presumably he will oppose the strike, yet he supported the resolution. Did he take this course merely in order to associate himself with a popular demand and in the hope of bluffing the Government into making concessions?

Tom Shaw supported the resolution without referring to the strike.

Brace clearly revealed the fact that he is looking to the nationalisation question as an election battle-cry. He said that Havelock Wilson's speech would supply most of the propaganda 'we shall have to meet when we go to the country,' and 'the Government will not give way the first time of asking.' Smillie replied that of course the Government would refuse to move if the workers approached it, saying: "We don't think you will move." Labour must determine that the Government must act; then it would.

The Miners' resolution was carried by 4,478,000 to 77,000. 380,000 votes, which should have been cast in support of the resolution, were lost because Mr. A. Hayday, M.P., had gone out with the card of the National Union of General Workers; his colleagues protested loudly, but in vain.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE CENSURED.

The report of the Parliamentary Committee stated:

"By the terms of the resolution passed at a joint Conference, held in Southport on the 16th of April, your Committee was urged to convene a special National Conference of the Trade Union movement, so as to enable the affiliated Societies to decide what action, if any, should be taken to compel the Government to comply with all or any of the terms of the resolution passed at the League of Nations Conference."

The Parliamentary Committee decided not to call a Conference till it had approached the Government. Mr. Bonar Law was interviewed on May 22nd. The report states that the Parliamentary Committee:

"bearing in mind that so new and far-reaching a principle as that involved in a national industrial strike on political issues was one of grave concern, came to the following conclusion: That the interview is satisfactory enough to justify the Parliamentary Committee in refusing to call a special Conference to discuss whether industrial action shall be taken to enforce the abolition of the Conscription Act, the withdrawal of troops from Russia, the raising of the blockade, the release of conscientious objectors, and the withdrawal of the Secret Military Circular."

In moving the reference back of this paragraph, Robert Smillie made probably the finest speech and bravest speech he has ever delivered; a speech which revealed him in

character, in courage and sincerity, far above any other man who is prominent in the official Labour movement. His declaration that the Bolsheviks and the Soviets, "those men in Russia to-day, are fighting for Socialism for the whole world," the first such declaration yet made in a British Labour Conference, was received with an outburst of fervent enthusiasm unequalled during the Congress.

Smillie asserted emphatically that the policy of the Congress and its executive should be decided, through the delegates, by the members outside. The few who were not prepared to condemn the Government had no right to obstruct the desires of the rank and file. The majority of the Parliamentary Committee admitted, he said, that the present Government had secured office under false pretences. If a Government, even a Labour Government, refused to fulfil promises on the strength of which it had been returned to power, it was the duty of the nation to take any and every action to turn that Government out.

When the miners had brought the resolution in question before the League of Nations Conference, Mr. Stuart Bunning, who was Chairman also of that Conference, had ruled it out of order, on the ground that the delegates, having come from political as well as from industrial organisations, were not competent to deal with it. The miners therefore held they were entitled to have their resolution discussed by an industrial Conference.

The Parliamentary Committee's report boasted that 'plain speaking had been the rule' by those who comprised its deputation to Bonar Law. Smillie replied bitterly, "I know something about approaching Cabinet Ministers, and I have found that speaking, however, plain, makes no difference, unless it is in a certain direction. I find no indication that they said they would call a Conference to consider direct action. The Parliamentary Committee thought Mr. Bonar Law's reply so favourable that a Conference was unnecessary, I have searched in vain to find anything favourable in his reply."

Smillie declared that the Parliamentary Committee does not possess the confidence of the Labour movement. There is no Labour movement in the world that is so strongly organised as the British movement, the word of the Parliamentary Committee ought to be strong enough to compel the Government, but in fact, the Government pays very little attention to it. There was no greater question in the world than the question of Russia. "Mr. Churchill has given an assurance," the delegates roared with laughter. Smillie continued:

"I have as high an opinion of Churchill as of any politician, but we have been deceived too often. I wish this paragraph referred back. I want to make our Parliamentary Committee representative of the movement. The movement has got beyond the members of the Parliamentary Committee; some of them are living way back in a world of 40 years ago; they do not understand the new aspirations of democratic Labour.... The Parliamentary Committee must know that they are the servants and not the masters of the movement."

Robert Williams seconded the reference back, and said that the Parliamentary Committee should be tired of fruitless deputations, he had been accused of rattling the sword, "but all the Parliamentary Committee does is to rattle its chains."

Stuart Bunning, the Chairman, then rose weakly complaining: Smillie had misrepresented the Parliamentary Committee, he protested. "We did not accept Churchill's assurance. Smillie ridiculed our plain speaking. We said 'supposing an unsatisfactory reply from you: if a Conference is called, if a general strike is decided on, it will be a general strike

with all that, a general strike entails.' Was not that plain speaking?"

Yes, Mr. Stuart Bunning, it was; but your threat was an empty one: and you let the Government know that. Why did you not call the Conference?

Cathery of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union said, he was prepared to accept Col. John Ward's verdict in support of the intervention in Russia.

When are we going to see the new spirit making itself felt in this retrograde Union?

Clynes, the ablest reactionary in the movement, mounted a seat to fight against the motion. He observed that there was no resolution on the agenda dealing with this question. "If millions of working men were eager for an opportunity to reverse the Committee's decision, that feeling would have found some expression on the agenda.... The Triple Alliance went so far as to prepare a ballot paper. We know what has happened to those ballot papers; they are buried beneath the weight of dissatisfaction within the Triple Alliance."

The vote of censure on the Parliamentary Committee was carried by 2,586,000 votes to 1,876,000. The rebel element greeted the result with tremendous cheers.

The vote is a victory for the Bolshevik policy, the Russian policy, and marks the steady progress which revolutionary Socialism is making in the organised Labour movement.

The reference back was an indirect victory for Direct Action, but the issue was more definitely raised later by this resolution moved by Tom Shaw of the Textile Workers:

"That this Congress declares against the principle of industrial action in purely political matters."

DIRECT ACTION.

The clear-cut issue was feared alike by many opponents and supporters of Direct Action. Both J. H. Thomas and Frank Hodges expressed regret that the issue had been raised, but Smillie declared that no one should say he had buried the issue and repudiated the idea that he did not want the conference which the P.C. was to call to declare for Direct Action.

Tom Shaw began with a fierce but silly attack on Lenin and the Soviet Government.

THOMAS VACILLATES.

J. H. Thomas spoke on the resolution, now opposing it, now supporting it. He said that Congress had not been committed to direct action by the vote of censure passed on the Parliamentary Committee and characterised this definite resolution as "dangerous." He did not plainly say, as might have been expected of him, that the resolution was dangerous, because it might be carried, but because it was difficult to define what is a political question.

He alleged that in 1910 at Dundee Winston Churchill stated he was in favour of nationalising the railways on condition that the railwaymen were disfranchised. Thomas indicated that he would support a strike of railwaymen against disfranchisement, but would oppose a strike for nationalisation. The Labour movement, he said, had two arms, one political, the other industrial. He did not agree that if one failed, it was possible to turn to the other.

"If we are to use the industrial instead of the political weapon, let us abolish Parliament and the Labour Party. Don't let us humbug ourselves by saying we want to run both policies together; they are irreconcilable; they cannot be run together.... This motion, if carried, may be used by our opponents as a lever against us. We shall have a general election; don't give our opponents a lever against our candidates."

From the standpoint of the reformist and "Social Patriot," Thomas is right; the party that advocates direct action will lose the support of many moderate voters. Thomas by his words—"On the political side we have

not been deserted by the people outside our movement but by the people inside"—showed that he places most faith in the Liberal votes that are coming over to Labour. To men of the Thomas school the political is narrowed down to the Parliamentary, and they are right in contending that the political and Parliamentary weapons cannot much longer be used together; for the inevitable outcome of industrial action is revolution, and the Soviets. Moreover, when the mental atmosphere of the movement is ripe for Parliamentaryism, direct action seems brutal and dangerous; and when the time is fully ripe for the industrial revolution, Parliamentary action will be brushed aside as futile and contemptible.

The attack which Thomas made on direct action was tempered by the fear that the resolution might be defeated and the Conference committed to industrialism. But doubtless another consideration also influenced him. Though he opposes direct action, he is too much of a politician not to realise that political capital can be made out of its possibilities. When the Labour Party thinks a General Election to its advantage, what could be easier than to say: "Whilst we should deplore such a proceeding, organised Labour will undoubtedly strike, unless a constitutional opportunity is given to the country to declare itself on these issues." What could be easier than to indicate subtly that the restraining influence of Labour leaders will be relaxed unless an election is held. Moreover, a dangerous unpopularity may be visited upon leaders who appear cold towards Labour's aspirations. The most successful method of leading the workers backward has always been to march forward with them for a time.

HODGES AND SOVIET RUSSIA.

Shaw had attacked Soviet Russia and many miners' delegates, rank-and-filers, not "prominent men" with "national reputations," were busy scribbling notes, in order to reply to him. They gave way at the rising of Frank Hodges, their general secretary. He made, as he always does, a clever lawyer-like speech; but his only reference to Soviet Russia was:

"Mr. Shaw said to my surprise that the desire of the direct action movement is to establish the Soviet system in this country. There is nothing more remote from the truth. I do not believe, with the characteristics of the British race, and with our traditions and institutions, a Soviet system of Government would ever become adaptable to our country."

Hodges has obviously failed to study the Soviet system. He went on to argue that the failure of 20 million people to rise to the occasion at the last general election should not prevent them from bringing industrial pressure upon the Parliament they had elected. He insisted that if the workers now felt, "given another opportunity we would not return a Coalition Government to power," and if Parliament paid no heed to the wave of opinion "then men in the working class movement, if they have any working class feeling in their souls, must look for some other means..... The antagonism between political and direct action will grow. It will reach its pinnacle when the industrial classes challenge the existence of the capitalist system. I warn you in preparation for that day, which may be far distant, or may be near: do not create a new tradition which will effectively prevent you from acting at the great historical moment."

Hodges is thus a revolutionary. Does he believe that at "the great historical moment" the old parliamentary machine will be the organ which will co-ordinate the revolution: the organ through which revolting Labour will express itself? Does he not rather visualise some instrument akin to the Trade Union Congress as Labour's tribunal? Is

not the Soviet an improved development of the Trade Union Structure?

Hodges finds the need of a power which will enable the rank and file to force their will upon the legislature without waiting for a General Election: the Soviet system makes the delegates subject to recall.

Hodges feels the need for the miners to impress their will, as miners, upon the electorate: under the Soviet system the delegates represent industrial aggregations.

Does Hodges doubt that when Thomas, Brace, and their like have formed a Labour Government they will prove as subservient to Capitalism as they now are to the capitalist Government? Then the Soviets will come into power.

ENGINE DRIVERS FOR DIRECT ACTION.

Thomas, the dominant secretary of the great N.U.R., opposes direct action: all his power and influence will be used to crush it. The railway men who throw in their lot with the general strike, will probably find their chief officer lined up with the Government against them. In the House of Commons recently, he declared himself in favour of using the troops to man the railways in such a case. But there is another powerful railway union, smaller than the N.U.R., but largely holding the key to the situation: the Association of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen. J. Bromley, its secretary, had come with the Union's mandate in support of direct action.

Thomas had seemed to appeal for the previous question, though he had not moved it. Mills, of the A.S.E., now did so. His motion was carried by 2,255,000 votes to 2,086,000, the miners voting with the minority. So the issue was buried and sent back for decision by the special conferences on the Nationalising the Mines, the Intervention in Russia and Conscription.

THE SEQUEL TO THE CENSURE.

There was much speculation as to whether the Parliamentary Committee would call the desired conference on Russia and Conscription, without further instructions, now that it had been censured for its previous refusal. On Friday the matter was settled by the adoption of the following resolution, moved by J. H. Thomas:—

"That this Congress, in view of the general desire of the country, and the repeated declarations of the Government prior to, during, and since the recent General Election, as reiterated to the deputation from the Parliamentary Committee which interviewed the leader of the House of Commons (Mr. Bonar Law) on the 22nd of May last, instructs the Parliamentary Committee to demand of the Government the repeal of the Conscription Acts, and the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Russia, and, failing this, demands that a special Trade Union Congress be called immediately to decide what action shall be taken."

Thomas, by his denunciation of Soviet Russia, has done much to bolster up the Government's support of the counter-revolution. By moving this resolution he will now gain the approbation of many who oppose the intervention. He is certainly an adept in politics!

S. Shanks, who seconded the motion, made a telling point, when he urged that the very people now declaiming against direct action, are those who raised an outcry because the German trade unionists did not use direct action at the beginning of the war.

ROBERT SMILLIE OPPOSES REVOLUTION.

Robert Smillie, who had defended the Russian revolution so finely, and had sturdily declared for the general strike, now inconsistently complained that he is accused of fermenting revolution.

"Personally," he said, "I am prepared to give that the lie direct. I accept that kind of thing from dukes and capitalists and capitalist newspapers, but it is too mean, too contemptible for one comrade to say it of another. I am an evolutionary revolutionist. I have for thirty

years preached the necessity of an industrial revolution in this country. I do not want to see an armed or bloody revolution."

Has Smillie really thought the matter out to its logical conclusion? If there is a great general strike on one or more of the three great questions for which the Glasgow Congress has demanded conferences, does he not admit the possibility that the Government will use violence to coerce the workers? Does he not admit that the Government may probably take these steps:—

1. Arrest the trade union officials.
2. Sequester trade union funds.
3. Use troops and police to replace the strikers.
4. Mobilise the strikers under the Military Service Acts to perform industrial functions.
5. Fire on demonstrations of strikers.

If the Government should adopt all, or any of these measures, does Smillie propose that the workers should abandon the strike? If they stand by the strike and resist, does he not see that a revolutionary situation will be created?

Is it not madness to shut our eyes to these probabilities, instead of making ready to meet them, by preparing the workers in industry, the Army, Navy and the police force to carry out a successful revolution when the time of conflict arrives?

The Finnish Socialists, in their "Open Letter to Lenin" say:—

"At the end of January, 1918, Finnish capitalism set its troops to attack the workers." But, "we who were in charge of the revolutionary movement gave less attention to the organisation of the campaign than to law making and the re-arrangement of administration. . . . Our mental conflict, and unreadiness lent a mischievous uncertainty to our movements from which grew up a general discontent with the leaders of the revolutionary army. It is tragic that perhaps these mistakes of ours were responsible for the defeat of the workers' cause when the scales of victory or defeat were hanging in the balance. The process of evolution will in any case take its toll in human life, but the cost, if we had acted boldly, would have been smaller."

SUPPLIES TO COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES NOT MENTIONED.

It will be noticed that the resolution asks for the withdrawal of British troops from Russia, but mentions neither the supplies of munitions and so on which are being sent to the counter-revolutionaries, nor the blockade.

Brotherton, A.S.E., raised the question of munitions, saying that he and the men associated with him who are making munitions object to being employed on such work and wish the munition factories to be engaged in manufacturing useful things. He moved that the resolution be amended, but the chairman immediately called on Tom Shaw and J. R. Clynes, then closed the discussion. Brotherton's amendment, unseconded, fell to the ground.

If the Parliamentary Committee interprets the resolution narrowly, asking merely for the withdrawal of British troops, the Government may be able to satisfy the deputation without ceasing to attack Soviet Russia. If the Labour movement means business it will not allow itself to be hauled in this way, but reaction clutches at every loophole, every opportunity for delay.

Again Clynes supported reaction. Smillie, he sneered, did not desire violence, but that was the first thing direct action would create. It is easier to bring millions of men out than to get men back, he argued, and the Government and the other sections of the community would not simply wait for Labour's victory.

"Surely all experience is against any such tame and impotent conclusion as that . . . the stoppage of the industrial and social life would require on the part of the Government some attempt to keep things going, some attempt to get food and supply the immediate needs of life. . . . You are alienating the sympathy of the great masses of well-meaning people of other classes without whose sympathy and support you cannot hope to capture the political machine. . . . Imagine the Labour Government in power. . . . Are you going to concede, in the days of Labour's power, to every other class the right to resist your laws . . . by the use of the strike weapon, you will, I say, set to all other classes the bad example you ought to be the first

* Peoples' Russian Information Bureau, 152, Fleet-street, 1d.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

Editor: Sylvia Pankhurst

Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation.

Annual Subscription, post free—10s. 10d

Back Numbers, 4d., post free.

MSs. should be addressed to the Editor at
400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3.

All business communications to the MANAGER
152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.
Telephone: Central 7240.

Vol. VI. No. 26

Sat. Sept. 30th, 1919

TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

Continued.

to avoid. . . . Labour is only beginning to learn how to govern. . . . I beg you not to challenge the existence of the State and claim the right to a class dictatorship. You must lead other classes, guide them, convert them. . . . they will join you in asking to change the conditions which oppress them equally with yourselves."

Clynes has here fallen into much fallacious reasoning. We think he is right in saying that the Government would not stand idly by during a general strike, though he exaggerates the consequences of a mere demonstration strike for a day or two. His contention that Labour must not use the general strike now, because, if it does, other classes will use the strike against a Labour Government, is absurd. Firstly, capitalism is not in a position to use the strike weapon so effectively; and, secondly, capitalism will certainly use the strike and any other available weapon against a Labour Government, whether Labour has set the example or not. Moreover, it should be the business of a Labour Government to abolish "other classes," not to conciliate them; the warning Clynes utters against setting up a "class dictatorship" seems to indicate that he does not recognise this. He talks as though "other classes" would always remain. We are of opinion that Clynes and the others who speak of the strike as a boomerang that may rebound against a future Labour Government are fearing rather the action of the still exploited workers than that of the privileged classes. In spite of Clynes, the resolution was carried with but two dissentients.

THE POLICE UNION.

The passages in the Parliamentary Committee's report dealing with the Police Union grossly misrepresent the facts, and convict the Parliamentary Committee of mean disloyalty to one of its affiliated societies, the Police and Prison Officers' Union. Page 5 of the report states that the Home Secretary accused the Police Union's representatives of breaking an agreement entered into with Sir George Cave. The following clause in "the signed agreement" is quoted:—

"The organisation shall be entirely within the force, and shall be entirely independent of, and unassociated with, any outside body."

When one turns to page 81 one discovers that the clause is taken, not from an agreement concerning the Police Union which is a national organisation, but from one upon the Metropolitan Police Representative Board, which was supposed to be a sort of Whitley Council. This Board was accepted on September 18th as a temporary compromise, affecting the London police only, until the end of the war, when the police understood that their union would be recognised by the Government.

The report further states that application for affiliation to the Trade Union Congress was made in February, 1919, the Parliamentary Committee not being informed of the agreement. The inference is that the agreement was an obstacle to the affiliation, but that is not so, as the agreement only applied to the Metropolitan Police Board and not to the Union. This was admitted to the Parliamentary Committee by Sir Edward Troup.

The Commissioner of Police, Sir Neville Macready, who had taken part in the negotiations for forming the Board, himself broke the agreement on February 25th, 1919. Clause 12 of the agreement states:—

"In the event of a desire to bring matters before the higher authorities, a deputation of four delegates from the Committee shall have instant and direct access to the Commissioner in order to discuss the matters in question."

On such a deputation being elected by the police, the Commissioner declined to receive it. The Home Secretary supported Macready in thus breaking the agreement. The conflict between the Commissioner and the Board was not healed and the Board finally ceased to sit.

The agreement concerning the Metropolitan Board was bandied about in the House of Commons, and Mr. Sexton told Congress that it was produced in the House to convey the impression that Marston, the secretary of the Union, had agreed to the terms of the Police Bill.

When the Parliamentary Committee's deputation waited upon Mr. Shortt he produced also a document dating from September 12th, 1918, and agreed to as a temporary war measure. It was signed by Sir George Cave and James Marston in the presence of the Union Executive. It stated that there would be no objection to policemen belonging to the Union, provided it did not interfere with the regulations and discipline of the force, or attempt to induce its members to withhold their services: if this condition were broken, policemen might be called to leave the Union.

To sign this document, especially as it contains no statement that it is a temporary war measure, was, in our opinion, a very grave mistake, but we are by no means sure that the Parliamentary Committee would have said so at the time.

During the interview with Shortt Mr. Gosling again and again disclaimed any intention to complain of the Government. Mr. Davis said:—

"I do not see how the Police Union in the ordinary sense could exist."

Mr. Havelock Wilson took the part of the Government quite openly, saying:—

"Has not the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee been asked quite recently to call a special conference of delegates for the purpose of declaring in favour of direct action? Assuming that the police are associated with the Trade Union Congress what will be their position?"

J. H. Thomas replied that the police could dissociate themselves, but Wilson insisted: "That would not help them."

J. H. Thomas referred to the railwaymen who supported the police, saying that they only came out "in defiance of over-rule and order and everything else. . . . I hope it will be a warning to them."

Marston and Hayes put the case for the police, the latter pointed out that when the agreement regarding the Metropolitan Police Board was signed, the Union was already affiliated to the Labour Party and to a number of Trades Councils. He declared that the police would continue their struggle whether they received the help of the Trade Union Congress or not. They had been led to believe that the trade union movement would not see them go under for standing by trade union principles, and if the men who had struck were sacrificed the responsibility would rest not with the Union's officials, but with the trade union movement.

Citrine, of the Liverpool E.T.U., who has been their steadfast champion throughout, ably supported the police. He said that the Police Union's officials had written days before the strike to the Parliamentary Committee, but had received no reply, and the Union only heard of the Parliamentary Committee's deputation after it had taken place. The Parliamentary Committee, by advising the movement to give financial assistance to the police, had admitted the justice of their case; let the Committee get

the men reinstated, even if it failed to secure recognition of the Union.

Bevin, of the Dockers' Union, expressed great sympathy with the police; he declared that every trade union secretary had at some time been forced to sign obnoxious agreements, Sexton, who had heaped reproaches upon Marston for signing these documents, had himself been obliged to walk off the Liverpool docks at the employers' bidding. Bevin urged plenty of financial support for the victimised police, but pleaded that the paragraph should not be referred back because it would be impossible to get the great industrial machine working on this issue. Hayes responded to the appeal and withdrew the motion. We fail to see why the reference back of an inaccurate and caddish paragraph should necessarily imply a strike. Moreover, we believe that the Government's treatment of the police has been greatly resented throughout the trade union world.

A resolution was adopted without dissent demanding the amendment of the Police Act to provide for the exercise of trade union rights; condemning the Government's repressive treatment of the Police Union; calling for the Union's recognition and the reinstatement of the strikers; and instructing the Parliamentary Committee to take "all necessary steps to prevent the militarising of the police force."

THE FRATERNAL DELEGATES.

Mr. Hynes, from the American Federation of Labour, spoke nervously from a typewritten manuscript. He boasted of American Labour's patriotic war effort. He echoed the political views of Gompers. The trade union movement, he was persuaded, should have no political bias or policy of its own, and its members, without loss of consistency, might belong to any capitalist party. He complained that during the year "the professional class" had attempted to form a Labour Party.

Mr. Hynes was no less vehement in his attack on the One Big Union movement, which he declared to be making little or no headway. He also attacked the sympathetic strike, which he said had failed after three days in Seattle and after six weeks in Winnipeg.

Watters, the Canadian delegate, declared the war to be a question of profiteering, and stated that if there had been no profit on shells all the boys might have been killed, but not a shell would have reached the front. The Canadian Government had disfranchised many thousands of voters in order to secure its own re-election. The new Immigration Act made it possible to deport anyone not born in Canada. The aim was to deport the British-born men who are the most active in the trade union movement. The Canadian Trade Union Congress is peculiarly placed, because most of its unions cover both Canada and U.S.A., with their headquarters in U.S.A. Obviously the reactionary U.S. officials are often a hindrance to Canada; the Canadian Trade Union Congress took the initiative in forming a political Labour Party two years ago.

Watters joined issue with Hynes on the general strike and the One Big Union. Had the strikes in Seattle and Winnipeg succeeded, he declared, they would have been considered the right thing to do. As for the One Big Union, the Calgary Convention had decided to take a referendum on it, and, by an enormous majority, all the Canadian unions, from Winnipeg westward, had decided to withdraw from the international organisations and link up with the One Big Union.

HENDERSON, POLITICIAN.

Henderson's loud voice rang through the hall. The popularity of Labour leaders is measured very largely by their power to make themselves generally heard in Conference. Most delegates are only heard by a few, and whoever has voice enough to reach everyone's ears at once, begins to be a leader of sorts, shout he never so foolishly.

Henderson began with the absurd remark that the next few years will determine this country's destiny and that on the guidance of the Trade Union Congress will depend whether

THE ACTIVITY of the RUSSIAN PEOPLE'S COMMISSARIAT FOR SOCIAL WELFARE.

By ALEXANDRA KOLLONTAY.

The People's Commissariat for Social Welfare, which arose from the will of the workers' and peasants' revolution, represents an entirely new departure for Russia. There is nothing in the past that is equivalent to it. Under the old régime, the needy population depended entirely on the scant alms of charity organisations. The latter represented merely the caprice of people who did not know how to kill time; the practical results of their work was therefore equivalent to zero. The November revolution has done away with this penny charity, and has put in its place the duty of the State toward all working citizens. The many-sided activity of the Commissariat for Social Welfare, and the tasks which it must meet, found their expression in the "Provisions for Social Welfare for Workers," confirmed October 31st, 1918, by the Council of People's Commissaries. In accordance with these provisions, welfare work applies without exception to all workers who obtain their livelihood by their own work, without exploitation of other people's work, and when we recall that with the introduction of obligatory labour duty, and with the nationalisation of capitalistic enterprises, the bourgeoisie must disappear in Soviet Russia, it is clear that in the near future the social welfare work must include all classes of the population of the Russian Federal Soviet Republic.

Welfare activity is applicable, according to the new decree, to all cases that have lost all means of subsistence, either through temporary incapacity for work, through general debility, mutilation, pregnancy, etc., or through permanent incapacity for work. According to the law, one has a right to welfare attention, even in cases of loss of the means of subsistence through unemployment, where such is not the fault of the unemployed. It is far from the intentions of the organs of social welfare to take steps to prevent sickness and mutilation, but it is their intention to provide for the whole population, every possible kind of medical aid, beginning with first aid in cases of sudden illness, up to every possible medical treatment of a special nature, such as that provided in ambulatories, sanatoriums, etc. In addition, every worker has a claim to medicaments and to special medical instruments, artificial limbs, etc. In cases of temporary loss of the ability to work, through disease or mutilation, compensations amounting to the sum earned by the unemployed are granted up to the time of complete restoration of health. Pregnant and confined women receive aids of like amount for a period of eight weeks preceding and eight weeks following confinement, if they are physical workers. Other cases receive such aid for six weeks. In cases of unemployment, the aid is granted up to the day of re-employment, at the rate of the smallest compensation in the locality in question that is permitted by its tariff. In case of permanent lack of employment, or unemployment for more than sixty per cent. of the working time, a full allowance is paid; in other words, for one month, twenty-five times the average daily wage of the locality in which the unemployed man lives; where unemployment amounts to 45-60 per cent. of working time, three-quarters of this allowance is paid; for 30-45 per cent., one-half; for 15-30 per cent., one-fifth of the full allowance.

According to its functions, the Commissariat for Social Welfare is divided into the following sections:—

I. SECTION FOR CHILDREN'S HOMES.—

Among the duties of this section are the care for children without guardians, such as the exposed child (foundling), orphans, illegitimates, children of beggar women and prostitutes, children who have been taken away from their parents by law (criminals, drunkards, street vendors, etc.), as well as abnormal children of three classes: (1) morally abnormal, who have committed a crime, and to whom the law of January 17th, 1918, is applicable (according to this law, courts are abolished for minors and they are assigned to the care of the People's Commissariat for Social Welfare); (2) Mentally abnormal children; (3) Physically abnormal children. The Section for Children's Homes establishes asylums, communes and homes for children in order in this way to replace their families. In these asylums and homes, the principle of labour and the principle of children's independence are carried out. The children's homes are connected with libraries, clubs, playgrounds, workshops, etc. After attaining a certain age, the children of these asylums and homes, as well as all other children, must attend the schools which are open to all. In the children's homes and asylums the children remain until the age of seventeen, whereupon they enter life for themselves, without relieving the State, however, of the continuance of its care, in accordance with the "provisions." According to the reports, up to January 1st, 1919, more than 100,000 children are under such supervision in Russia, and there are 1,500 children's homes. In the near future, a further considerable number of homes and asylums is to be opened.

II. SECTION FOR CARE OF MOTHERS AND INFANTS.—

This section has established, in large numbers, asylums and homes for the pregnant. For women in confinement living-in establishments have been organised, in which the mothers obtain instruction in the nourishment and care of children. After leaving such establishments, the mother, together with the new-born child, is placed in a new home which is under supervision of special physicians. In the factories and works, as well as in the country, at the time of work in the fields in summer, day nurseries are established, in which mothers can feed their own children: orphaned infants are taken care of in special institutions under medical supervision, in which the children are fed. The Section for the Care of Mothers and Infants has its own dairies, in which milk is provided for the mothers and children. In addition, they supervise the milk trade, in so far as the latter is intended for children. The section has also established courses for the instruction of those supervising these homes, in which the students receive, in addition to general instruction, also certain specific instruction.

III. SECTION FOR THE WAR-MAIMED.—

The chief task of this section is to make the maimed capable of performing such variety of work as is compatible with their individual mutilations. With this in view, the section aims particularly to secure the greatest possible restoration of normal health in the individual in order to prepare him for work that will be in accordance with the character of his mutilation. For cripples, there is a great number of the most varied workshops in which they may apply their forces and their energy. In Moscow, there are ten vocational courses for cripples.

IV. SECTION FOR INVALIDS.—According to data thus far received, which are as yet by no means complete, this section is at present taking care of about 65,000 old men and women, who are living in 2,000 homes. In the near future, a thorough transformation of the homes intended for invalids is proposed: they are to be based on a model unit for 50 and 100 inmates, instead of the numbers hitherto sheltered. In these homes, the principle of labour and the principle of independence are carried out as far as possible.

V. OUTSIDE AID.—Permanent financial aid is at present granted not only to the unemployed, but also to the families of Red Army men. At a very early date, a decree will probably be issued as to the care of families of physicians and victims of the counter-revolution. The maximum annual allowance of this kind is 2,000 rubles per person. In the decree of the Council of People's Commissaries on Social Welfare, the payment of allowances to all men over fifty, all women over fifty-five is provided: yet the serious financial situation, together with the continued war needs, which are at present forced upon Russia, make it impossible to carry out this decree with absolute completeness; for this reason, the invalids, as has been already mentioned, obtain aid in the form of actual necessities, at the various homes.

VI. TEMPORARY AID.—As a matter of principle, aid is granted to the needy soldiers of the old army, namely, to 400,000 men (according to the financial report more than 1,000,000,000 rubles have been paid out this way). In addition, the section has established workshops of all kinds, in order to secure work for the needy population. For the same purpose, Government constructions are being undertaken, cheap and even free eating houses established, dwelling places and night lodgings opened. A great amount of work arises for this section from the fact that it provides aid for fugitives from the localities that have been taken by the White Guardists.

VII. SECTION FOR AID TO THE VICTIMS OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION.—This section provides aid for the workers in the Soviet and the Party, who have suffered under the counter-revolution, also to political fugitives who are returning with the Red Army. For the purpose of aiding fugitives and victims of the counter-revolution, all sorts of agricultural communes are established, while persons of this kind may obtain, previous to their assignment to such communes, a financial aid equivalent to the minimum necessary for maintaining life.

VIII. THE SECTION FOR RATIONS provides for the rationing of the soldiers of the old army and the families of the Red Guardsmen.

In addition to the above cited chief sections, there are also less important sub-divisions, such as that for the combating of mendicancy and of street vending.

In the second half-year of 1918, the People's Commissariat for Social Welfare spent 600,000,000 rubles, while the proposed budget for the first half-year of 1919 was for more than 2,000,000,000 rubles. The funds of the People's Commissariat for Social Welfare consist of payments of the following classes: For aids paid to mothers and the unemployed, in the form of a uniform impost for the entire territory of Soviet Russia; for the remaining varieties of welfare work, the amount to be paid in is fixed by the local organs of the People's Commissariat, on the basis of tariffs depending on the danger-class to which each occupation is assigned by the local authorities. All these funds together constitute a single, All-Russian Fund for Social Welfare.

From "The People's Russian Information Bureau."

TRADE UNION CONGRESS, continued.

this nation will hold its own against competing nations. Under satisfactory conditions the workers will bound to the productive needs of this nation, just as they did in 1914. It was a repetition of the "increased production" outcry, but Henderson puts the matter more cleverly than Brownlie, so he gets cheers whilst Brownlie is upbraided.

His voice growing louder and louder, Henderson appealed to the delegates not to relinquish Parliamentary action, to trust the Labour Party to work for it as never before. He appealed to them to work for it "for the sake of Ireland and Russia," and for the sake of Ireland and Russia to terminate the life of the present Government.

Arthur Henderson and the Labour Party have an opportunity to make a protest on Ireland's behalf now; how will they meet the suppression of Dail Eireann.

We should be interested to know whether Henderson is willing to pledge himself, if returned at the head of a Labour Government, to give Ireland complete independence, also

whether he would be prepared to enter into friendly relations with Soviet Russia. We do not forget Henderson's welcome to Kerensky when he came to this country asking for armed intervention against the Soviets; we do not forget his many bitter attacks upon the Communist Republics.

Henderson is but another Kerensky; he and his like will disappear when the Social Revolution comes.

FROM INDIAN WORKERS.

W. P. Wadia, President of the Madras Labour Union, came to tell Congress of suffering Indian Labour; of Bengal miners paid 7½d. a day, of textile workers paid as little as 10/9 a month.

When the Indian textile workers were striking, they were told that their wages could not be increased because of the Lancashire textile workers; when Lancashire workers wanted an increase the Indian workers were supposed to be standing in their way. Therefore the textile workers and all other workers must everywhere join hands in the fight against capitalism, whether the capitalists be white or coloured.

The Congress rose to its feet enthusiastically applauding the Indian comrade. A resolution was passed pledging financial assistance to the Indian trade union movement.

AN INDUSTRIAL PARLIAMENT.

A little noticed resolution, on which few delegates voted, dealt with a very important question, "the establishment of a real industrial Parliament of Labour." It instructed the Parliamentary Committee to approach the Executives of all Labour Federations and to prepare a scheme for the proposed body. The necessity for such a body is obvious: a Congress meeting once a year and an Executive of persons all closely involved in other work, meeting less than once a week, cannot possibly cope with the tremendous and growing needs of the Labour movement.

The leaven of new ideas is working within the Labour movement; an awakening is coming which will enable British workers to achieve their own emancipation and to set free all the subject peoples within the Empire.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

CHURCH AND SCHOOL IN THE SOVIET REPUBLIC.

BY RUSSIAN PEOPLE'S COMMISSARY N. BUKHARIN.

The working class and its party—the Communist-Bolshevik Party—aim not only at an economic liberation, but also at a spiritual liberation of the toiling masses. And the economic liberation itself will proceed all the more quickly, if the proletarians and day-labourers will throw out of their heads all the crazy ideas that the feudal landholders and the bourgeoisie and manufacturers have knocked into them. We have already seen how easy it was for the former governing classes to hedge in the workers on all sides with their newspapers, their magazines, handbills, their priests, as well as with their schools, which they had succeeded in transforming from an instrument of enlightenment into an instrument for obscuring the popular consciousness.

THE BELIEF IN GOD AND IN THE DEVIL IS A CONFUSION OF THE MIND OF THE WORKERS.

One of the instruments for the obscuring of the consciousness of the people is the belief in God and the devil, in good and evil spirits, angels, saints, etc., in short—religion. The masses of the people have become accustomed to believe in these things, and yet, if we approach these beliefs sensibly, and come to understand where religion comes from, and why religion receives such warm support from the bourgeois gentlemen, we shall clearly understand that the function of religion at present is to act as a poison with which the minds of the people have been and continue to be corrupted. And then we shall also understand why the Communist Party is so resolutely opposed to religion.

THE WORSHIP OF THE SOULS OF THE DEAD RICH WAS THE FOUNDATION OF RELIGION.

Present-day science has pointed out that the most primitive form of religion was the worship of the souls of dead chieftains, and that this worship began at the moment that, in ancient human society, the elders of the tribe, old men more wealthy, experienced and wise than the rest of the tribe, already had secured power over the remaining members. At the very outset of human history, when men still were in the semi-ape stage, they were equal. The elders did not put in their appearance until later, and then began the subjugation of the other members. Then also the latter began to worship the former, and this worship of the souls of the dead rich is the foundation of religion; these "saints," these little gods, were later transformed into a single threatening deity, who punishes and rewards, judges and regulates. Let us see why it was that this conception of things arose among men. The fact is that man always attempts to see things little known to him in the light of those with which he is well acquainted. He measures them with the yardstick of what he knows and understands. A scholar has recorded this example; a girl who had been brought up on an estate on which poultry-raising was extensively practised, was constantly occupied with eggs; eggs were constantly dancing before her eyes; and when she was confronted with the sky full of stars, she declared that eggs were scattered all over the sky. Any number of such examples might be given. Man observed that there were those who obeyed and those who issued commands; he was constantly confronted with this picture: the elder (later the prince), surrounded by his aides, was the wisest and most experienced, the strongest, the richest, and he issued the orders; and in accordance with his instructions the others acted: in short, they obeyed him. These relations were observable at all seasons and at all hours, and gave occasion to an interpretation of all occurrences as being due to similar causes. On earth, as it were, there are those who command and those who obey. Perhaps, people thought, the whole world is so constructed? The world also has its master, a great powerful, threatening creature, on whom all depends, and who will severely punish all disobedience. Now this master over all the world is God. Thus the conception of God in Heaven arises at the moment when on the earth below, the formerly unified society is divided up into those who obey and those elders who lead and command the tribe.

THE WORD "GOD" IS DERIVED FROM THE WORD "RICH."

In Russian this is the case. Bog (God) comes from the same root as "bogaty" (rich). It is an interesting fact that all the designations for God speak eloquently of this origin of religion. What does the word "Bog" mean? It is from the same root as "bogaty" (rich). God is he who is great and strong and rich. How else is God glorified? As the "Lord." What is a "Lord"? A "Lord" is a master and the opposite of "slave." In fact, in the prayers we say: "We are thy slaves." God is also glorified as "the ruler of the heavens." All the other appellations of God point in the same direction: "conqueror," "Dominus," etc. Precisely. A "Dominus" is a person who dominates, who rules over many others, who possesses a pretty good supply of wealth. What sort of thing, therefore, is God? God, so to speak, is a really rich, powerful master, a slave-holder, one who "rules the heavens," a judge—in a word, a precise counterfeit

and copy of the earthly power of the elder, later of the prince. When the Jews were ruled by their princes, who punished and tormented them in every possible way, there arose the doctrine of a God that was evil and malignant. Such is the God of the Old Testament. He is a ferocious old man who inflicts cruel punishments on his subjects.

EVENTS ON EARTH ARE PARALLELED IN HEAVEN.

Let us glance now at the God of the Orthodox Church. This conception was elaborated in Byzantium, which furnished the model for an autocratic régime. At the head of the state stood the autocratic monarch, surrounded by his ministers; then came, the superior office-holders, further down a whole system of legalised grafters. And the Orthodox Faith is a close replica of this system. At the head was the "Lord of the Heavens." Around him his foremost saints (such as the Wonderworker Nicholas, the Mother of God—somewhat of the nature of an Empress; a woman of holy spirit), corresponding to the ministers; further down there follows a whole series of angels and saints, arranged in an order similar to that of the "chinovniks" in the autocratic state. These are the so-called "officiating angels and arch-angels": the cherubim, the seraphim, the angels of the third and various other degrees. The very word "chin" (degree) reminds us of "chinovnik" (officer-holder, bureaucrat), and both words are from the same root. These degrees ("chins") are represented in the ikons by having them dressed more richly the higher the rank, and by having a larger halo about their heads—that is, they had more decorations and "orders," exactly as on the sinful earth beneath. In the autocratic state, the chinovnik demands "obligatory palm-grease," otherwise there is nothing doing; similarly, the saint requires his candle, otherwise his wrath is incurred, and he will refuse to transmit any prayer to his highest superior, God. In the autocratic state there are special chinovniks who, for a consideration, will undertake the special function of petitioners. And similarly, there are special saints who pray and "intercede in the behalf," particularly, of women. For instance, the mother of God, who is an "advocate" par excellence. And she does not do her work for nothing, to her must be built greater temples than to others; rice must be bought for her ikons, and the latter must be studded with more precious stones, etc., etc.

THE BELIEF IN GOD IS A BELIEF IN SLAVERY.

In short, the belief in God is an expression of the vile conditions on earth, is the belief in slavery, which is present, as it were, not only on earth, but in the whole universe besides. It is of course clear that there is no truth in these things. And it is also clear that these fairy-tales are a hindrance in the path of human progress. Humanity will not advance until it has become accustomed to seek for a phenomenon its natural explanation.

But when, instead of explanations, faith is put in God or in the saints, or in the devils and wood-sprites, there is no likelihood that any useful purpose will be attained. Let us take a few examples. There are some religious people who believe that when the thunder rolls, Elijah is riding in his chariot. They, therefore, whenever they hear the roll of thunder, take off their hats and cross themselves. And as a matter of fact, the very same electrical energy, which is responsible for the thunder, is very well known to science, and it is with its aid that we propel our tramways, which give us the power to carry anything we like. And while the old Elijah was of no use as a means of transportation, our modern electrical Elijah is indeed a charioteer of the first order. We should have no more been enabled ever to behold any tramways, than to see our own ears. In other words, depending on religion alone, we should have continued to wallow in barbarism. Another example. The war breaks out, men are destroyed by the millions, oceans of blood are shed. An explanation is sought for this. Those who do not believe in God see the how, the why and the wherefore; they recognise that the war is the work of the Czars and Presidents, of the greater bourgeoisie and the landholders; they see that the war is waged in the interests of base and covetous aims. And therefore they say to the workers of all countries: "Take arms against your oppressors, cast down capital from its seat of power!" But with the religious man the case is entirely different. He reasons thus (and gasps like a little old man as he reasons): The Lord has punished us for our sins. "Oh, Holy Father, Lord of Heaven, rightly hast Thou chastised us sinful men!" And if he is very religious and orthodox in the bargain, he will set about emphatically eating one kind of food instead of another (which he calls fasting), and beating his head on the stone flags (which is known as "prostration"), and performing a host of other follies. Similar follies are practised by the religious Hebrew, the Mohammedan Tartar, the Chinese Buddhist, in a word, by all those who believe in God. From all of which it is evident that really religious people are not fit for any kind of fighting. Religion therefore not only causes the people to remain in a state of barbarism, but fits them also

for the condition of slavery. The religious man is more readily inclined to accept everything without a murmur (since everything, of course, comes from God), and to submit to the powers that be, and to suffer in patience ("for everything will be requited a hundredfold up yonder"). It is therefore not surprising that the powers in control under Capitalism should consider religion an extremely useful instrument for the deceiving of the people.

THE CHURCH WAS AN ORGANISATION OF THE BOURGEOIS STATE.

We have seen that the bourgeoisie is maintained not only by bayonets, but by the process of confusing the minds of its slaves. We have likewise seen, on the other hand, that the bourgeoisie poisons the consciousness of its subjects in an organised and planful manner. This purpose is served by a special organisation, and this organisation is the Church, the religious organisation of the State. In almost all the capitalistic countries the Church is a state institution of the very same type as the police: the priest is a state official in the same sense as the hangman, the gendarme, the stool-pigeon. He receives a state subsidy for the venom which he circulates among the people. In fact, just there lies the great danger of the situation. If it were not for this unnatural, entrenched and powerful organisation which is kept in countenance by the brigand state of the bourgeoisie, we should not stand for a single priest for a single moment. They would pass alive into immediate insolvency. But the fact is that the bourgeois State wholeheartedly places all of its means at the disposition of its church hierarchy, which in turn with ardent zeal supports the bourgeois power. Under the Czar the Russian priests not only deceived the people, but they even made use of the confessional for spying out the very thoughts that were hostile to the government; they used their "mysteries" for purposes of observation. And the government not only supported them, but persecuted with jails, deportation and all other possible means all so-called "defamers of the Orthodox Church."

WHY CHURCH AND STATE MUST BE SEPARATED.

From the above the programme of the Communists with regard to Church and State is clear. We must fight the Church, not with force, but with conviction. The Church must be separated from the State. This means, the priests may continue to exist—but let them be supported by those who wish to purchase their poison, or who have some other interest in their continued existence. Another poison of this type is opium. Those who have smoked it behold all sorts of lovely visions, are at once transported to Paradise. But the use of opium later results in a complete undermining of the health, and the user gradually becomes a complete idiot. It is similar with religion. There are persons who like to smoke opium. But it would be criminal for the State, at its expense, i.e., at the expense of the entire population, to maintain dens for the smoking of opium and to hire special persons to minister to the needs of the frequenters of these places. We must therefore proceed with the Church as follows (in fact, we have already done it): we must deprive the priests, hierarchs, metropolitans, patriarchs, abbots, and all the rest of the crowd, of all support from the government; let the true believers, if they like, feed them on sturgeon and salmon, of which the holy fathers are such devoted devourers.

RELIGION A PRIVATE MATTER.

On the other hand, we must guarantee freedom of belief. There necessarily follows the rule: Religion is a private affair. This does not in any sense mean that we must cease our struggle against the Church by conviction. It simply means that the State must not support any church organisation. The programme of the Bolshevik-Communists on this point is already carried out in Russia. The priests of all sects have been deprived of all State assistance. Of course, they nearly burst with rage at this affront and roundly cursed the present power, that is, the power of the workers, and read all of the Communists out of the Church. Think of this: under the Czar they knew very well the text: "There is no power but it descends from God," as well as the injunction: "Render obedience to all the powers that be." They had no objection to sprinkling the hangman with holy water. But why did they forget these texts as soon as the workers came into power? Or is it possible that the power of God is not extended also to Communists? What is the matter? The answer is very simple: The Soviet Government is the first government in Russia that hit the priests in the pocket. And this is the most sensitive spot a priest has. The priests are now in the camp of the "oppressed bourgeoisie." They are working below ground and above against the working class. But the times are bad, and the great masses of the workers no longer fall for the bait as they used to. That is the great educative accomplishment of the revolution. It liberates from economic slavery. But it also liberates from spiritual slavery.

(Continued on next page.)

DUBB DIALOGUES. By L. A. MOTLER.

Part V.

Scene—Trafalgar Square.

Characters—Henry Dubb and Literature Seller.

Henry—What was it the speaker said just now about the police?

Seller—She was remarking that Labour ought to back up the police now that they have decided to come into line with the rest of the workers and form a trade union of their own.

Henry—That's the first time I've heard as what the police was workers.

Seller—Of course, what it really means is that the police belong to the working class same as what you and I do.

Henry—I can't say as I have noticed a policeman work yet.

Seller—They are wage-slaves same as other workers. They sell their labour power in order to keep their wife and family.

Henry—The last speaker as I heard in Hyde Park said as what the police was watch-dogs for the capitalists.

Seller—So they are, in a manner of speaking.

Henry—But you said as they belonged to the working class.

Seller—That they do, but they have to take their jobs in the same way as others have to get jobs making furniture out of soap boxes and margarine out of Mike knows what.

Henry—Still, the Hyde Park man said as the police does the dirty work for the capitalists and that when it comes to a strike, they knows on which side their bread is buttered.

Seller—But it will be all different now they are beginning to wake up and form a trade union.

Henry—I suppose so; but I can't say as I have seen such a thundering lot of difference lately.

Seller—There are black sheep everywhere.

Henry—Then there is a brasted sight more black sheep in the police than what I have seen anywhere.

Seller—That is your opinion, of course; but the police are no worse than the general body of workers in the main.

Henry—But I don't see as how the police is workers; they don't produce nothing except a crop of broken heads now and again.

Seller—There is usually an unruly element in the most peaceful gathering and the police go for that sort.

Henry—Is that why the police went for Gallacher, Kirkwood and Shinwell?

Seller—Oh, that is quite different. I was talking of the London police; I know nothing of things in Glasgow.

Henry—Then what about that feller you call Ramsay, and Watson, and what about Ponder?

Seller—Those were vastly different things; the police didn't break any heads there.

Henry—But you said the police was friends of the working class.

Seller—What I said was that the police belonged to the working class.

Henry—I don't see such a muddy well of a difference.

Seller—The police come from the working class, as their parents were generally workers, and so they naturally belong to that class. Their action in forming a union of their own and refusing the official "union" shows they are waking to class-consciousness.

Henry—That doesn't prove they will use their sticks any the less on working class heads, or that the workers will only throw bricks at them wrapped in cotton wool. A brick is a brick and a policeman's stick is a stick.

Seller—The workers don't throw bricks at the police, even in a strike; that is really done by "agents provocateurs" who are paid to do it.

Henry—Who pays them? The police of course, so there you are in a nice hole.

Seller—It isn't the rank and file of the police that pays them, but the heads.

Henry—I thought you didn't believe in these police payments. What about that chap Watson?

Seller—Oh, that's different. We know Watson and it's another trick of the police to throw discredit on the prominent men in the movement.

Henry—There you go again—with them police. They seem a pretty bad lot, heads or no heads.

Seller—Well, they intend to have done with that sort of thing, from now on.

Henry—I don't see as how they can do that. After all what does the police exist for? To protect the capitalist, as the chap in Hyde Park said.

Seller—Police are necessary under the present system. Socialism will do away with all that.

Henry—How do you make that out?

Seller—Well, the present system is that wealth is not equitably distributed—which is different to a sharing-out system. The consequence is that those who have not enough, help themselves to other people's wealth.

Henry—But if you make out the present system to be wrong, the thieves and burglars are only taking back what belongs to them.

Seller—Not at all. Thieves and burglars are just as much parasites as dukes and financiers and capitalists.

Henry—But the thieves and burglars don't get a fair chance. I've heard many a Socialist say so.

Seller—All the more reason for hastening on the advent of Socialism.

Henry—In any case it doesn't prove the police are much good. I see in the papers every day of daylight burglaries and things like that. And I did read in a Socialist paper once that there have been ten unsolved murder mysteries in the last three years.

CHURCH AND SCHOOL
IN THE SOVIET REPUBLIC.

Continued.

THE SCHOOLS MUST BE AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE POOREST.

There is another important question in connection with the spiritual enlightenment of the masses. This is the school question.

Under the domination of the bourgeoisie, the school served the cause of the rearing of the masses in the sense of an obedience to the bourgeoisie, rather than of real instruction. All the textbooks, all the teaching implements, were permeated with the odour of slavery. Particularly the history textbooks: more lies than facts narrate the glorious deeds of the Czars and of other crowned rascals. And then: the priests played an important part in the schools. Everything worked in one direction: to prepare the child in such a manner as to make of him an obedient—not citizen, but subject; a slave, capable, if necessary, to kill his fellows if they should be so bold as to rise against the power of capital. The schools themselves were divided into classes, some for those of black blood, the rest for those of blue blood. The public schools and universities were for those of blue blood. Here the offspring of the bourgeoisie were taught all the sciences in order that they might govern and subjugate those of black blood. For those of black blood there were the lower schools. Here the priests held more undisputed sway than elsewhere. The task of these schools, which imparted very little knowledge, but handed out an uncommon mass of priestly lies, was to prepare the people who were to suffer, to obey, and to subordinate themselves to those of blue blood without protest. Entrance into the middle schools, and more particularly to the higher institutions of learning (universities, engineering schools, and all similar institutions) was definitely out of the question for those of the plain people. In this manner there was created a monopoly of education. The obtaining of a more or less decent education was possible only for the rich or for those supported by the rich. And the intelligentsia craftily exploited this situation in their own interest. And it is therefore plain why they were opposed to the workers in the November Revolution: they scented the danger to their privileges, their favoured position, which would disappear if all should have instruction, if even those of black blood should have the opportunity to acquire knowledge.

Seller—The police are not almighty: they are only human.

Henry—Yes, and so long as a policeman has a stick in his hand, I bet he makes for the nearest working class head.

Seller—I don't see the use of arguing if you're so set against the police.

Henry—Well, perhaps I am. Do you know what the Hyde Park chap said?

Seller—No.

Henry—The only good policemen are dead ones.

Soviet Russia is the Question of the Moment.

The PEOPLE'S RUSSIAN INFORMATION BUREAU, 152, Fleet St., London, E.C.4., publishes and stocks all pamphlets on this most important question.

JUST OUT.

The Origin and Growth of the Russian Soviets by M. Phillips Price. Post free 3jd.

The Aims of the Bolsheviks, by B. Shumiatzki. Post free 2jd.

*These two pamphlets make the Bolshevik policy and the Soviet System absolutely clear—you should not fail to read them.

Liberal America and Soviet Russia. Post free 1d.

British Troops in the Caucasus. Post free 1jd.

Trade Terms for Quantities.

FREEDOM.

A Journal of Anarchist Communism.

Monthly, 2d.; Annual Sub., 2s. 6d.

Agents wanted. 1s. 6d. for 13.

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, London, N.W. 1.

INSTRUCTION SHOULD BE UNIVERSAL AND COMPULSORY.

Before anything else, it is necessary to make education universal and compulsory. Under the new organisation of life, on new foundations, it will be necessary for those young in years to become accustomed to useful labour. The pupils in the schools must therefore become accustomed to various kinds of productive work. The gates of the higher institutions must be open to all. The priests must be kicked out of all the schools; if they like, let them ply their task of misguiding the young in some other place: they should not do so in the Government schools; the schools shall be worldly, of the world, not of the priests. The organs of the local workers' authority shall have control over the schools, and shall not stint their energies in the matter of popular education, supplying to all the children and young men and young women all the knowledge which they need for a happy life.

At present in certain villages and provincial schools some of the more stupid teachers, with the aid of the kulaks (or, more correctly speaking, the kulaks, with the aid of these stupid teachers), are carrying on a campaign with the object of pointing out that the Bolsheviks want to destroy all learning, to abolish all education, etc., etc. But this is of course a manifest lie. The object of the Communist-Bolsheviks is quite different: they wish to free all learning from the control of capital; they wish to make all science accessible to the working masses, they wish to destroy the monopoly (the exclusive right) of the wealthy in education. That is the fact of the matter. And it is not surprising that the wealthy should be eager to retain every reed on which they lean. When every worker has command of the learning of an engineer, then the case of the capitalist and wealthy engineer becomes sad indeed: there will be many more like him, and he will have nothing in particular to boast of. Then no upsetting of the workers' plans, no sabotage on the part of the old retainers of capital will any longer be possible. That is what our respectable bourgeois friends are afraid of.

Culture for the wealthy, spiritual debasement for the poor—that is the method of Capitalism. Culture for all, spiritual deliverance from the yoke of the capitalist—that is the watchword of the party of the working class, the Communist Party.

GIVE THIS PAPER TO A FRIEND.

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

THE COUNTY COUNCILS AND THE MIDWIVES.

Mrs. A. C. WEBB, writes:
"At present midwives are a hard-worked ill-paid body of women, the Cinderellas of the nursing profession."

The County Council undertake their training which is a very poor one, they are then placed on a district with barely a living wage, where they endure the discomfort of poor lodgings, poor pay, no friends. The old time untrained midwife of thirty years ago, living amongst her own friends in her own cottage with her husband to grow her vegetables, was in affluence by comparison with the midwife of to-day.

There is no provision for the midwife's old age. The County Superintendents, who are drawing good salaries, and are a great hindrance to any advancement. The doctors allow midwives to take cases, and then walk in and take the money, often doing nothing in the case besides.

I am a midwife of twenty years standing and acting both as a midwife and district nurse at present can hardly meet my expenses. In these days when people are talking so glibly of "Maternity and Child Welfare," can nothing be done for the midwife?

Immense sums of money are wasted in connection with their training, because the midwife, dissatisfied with the condition of things, generally leaves the work at the earliest opportunity."

IRELAND AS USUAL.

Political events for the week ending August 30th: 46 raids, 21 arrests by police and 1 sentence, 4 military raids and 4 Court Martial cases.

PERSECUTING THE I.W.W.

Ninety-five members of the I.W.W. are now in the Leavenworth Penitentiary, Kansas, U.S.A., serving sentences ranging from one to twenty years' imprisonment on the charge of violating the United States war legislation. In fact, they are guilty only of organising on industrial class lines. They are appealing against their sentences. In the United States this is an expensive procedure, but American citizens may obviate the cost by taking the oath in *forma pauperis*. But this may only be done by American citizens, and 15 of the prisoners are British subjects: J. J. Oats, Harry Lloyd, F. Fraser, R. Brasier, J. Manning, Albert Frasher and Charles Ashleigh are English; S. Scarlott, G. L. Lambert and D. Sheidan are Scotch, Herbert Mahler, A. Sinclair and E. McGosham are Canadians, P. McEvoy is Irish, and W. Moran is an Australian. The British subjects failing to move the U.S. authorities applied for aid to the British Ambassador at Washington and to the British Consul in Chicago. The Consul referred the question to the Ambassador, who replied that he could do nothing in the matter, and added impudently: "There is, of course, no objection on my part to your communicating direct with Members of Parliament provided your doing so is not contrary to the prison regulations."

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

For Revolutionary International Socialism, the ending of Capitalism and Parliament, and substitution of a World Federation of Workers' Industrial Republics.

Membership open to all Men and Women. Subscription 4d. per month, 4s. per annum. Write to the Secretary, 400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3. Telephone—East 1787.

LONDON MEETINGS—OUTDOOR.

FRIDAY, SEPT. 19th.

The Square, WOOLWICH, 12 noon.—Hy. Sara.

SATURDAY, SEPT. 20th.

Great Push for Communism and against Conscription and Intervention in Russia in HAMMERSMITH. Speakers: Minnie Birch, Melvina Walker and Guy Aldred. Meetings at The Grove (near railway stns.) at 3 and 7 p.m.

SUNDAY, SEPT. 21st.

Osborn Street, WHITECHAPEL, 11.45 a.m.—Ph. Edmunds.

Dock Gates, POPLAR, 7.30 p.m.—Phoebe Rickards, Melvina Walker (Chair.)

FRIDAY, SEPT. 26th.

Outside Siemens' Works, WOOLWICH, 12 noon—Melvina Walker and others.

SATURDAY SEPT. 27th.

Great Push in ST. PANCRAS.

Special Notice.

TOM MANN will speak at the Dock Gates, POP. LAR, on Sunday, Sept. 28th, at 7.30 p.m. Melvina Walker in the chair.

INDOOR.

MONDAY, SEPT. 22nd.

20 Railway St., 7.30 p.m.—Poplar W.S.F. Business Meeting. 8.30 p.m.—Reading Circle.

FRIDAY, SEPT. 26th.

400, Old Ford Road, 7-10 p.m.—Dancing.

AT ONE WITH GERMAN CAPITALISM

Soviet Russia, New York, reports:—

"The newspaper *Neue Nachrichten*, which is published at Berdyansk on the Sea of Azoff, for the German troops stationed there, publishes the following appeal from the Allies, encouraging an invasion of Russia:—

"We herewith bring to the attention of the inhabitants of Odessa and the vicinity that we have arrived on Russian territory, with the purpose of restoring order, as well as securing a liberation from Bolshevik usurpers, for which reason the reports issued by the provocative Bolsheviks, to the effect that the Allied armies had come to Southern Russia in order to drive out the Germans, are entirely untrue.

"The Germans, like us, did not come here as conquerors, but as defenders of the right, and therefore their aims and ours coincide at this point.

"The reports of imminent conflicts are untrue, and are circulated with the object of producing a panic.

"All the unhealthy elements in Russia—the Bolsheviks and their adherents—are declared to be outside the law. Persons sheltering Bolsheviks are to be handed over to immediate court-martial.

"We recognise only such organisations as are fighting against the Bolsheviks: the volunteer and Cossack armies, as well as the Army of the Constituent Assembly; in view of which, all organisations who are in possession of fire-arms are instructed to hand over the latter to the representatives of the internal armies appointed for this purpose."

"Signed by the following names:—

For England, Sir Nevil,

France, Hours,

Japan, Gajani,

Russia, Shilinski,

Italy, Saniti,

Belgium, D'Reimann,

Serbia, Silitsch,

Greece, Kargit,

Roumania, Grinesku.

"The effects of this terrible manifesto are depicted in a telegram from Tsarskoye-Selo, which says, among other things:

"Bloody conflicts are taking place in the South. Hundreds of workers have been hanged. The streets present the spectacle of many workers' bodies hanging in the air. The city commandant at Krasnoff publishes a telegram from Denikin, which orders that every tenth worker who is taken captive be hanged. In other centres mass hangings are taking place."

SOVIET RUSSIA AND EDUCATION.

Frazer Hunt in the *Chicago Tribune* reported that the Budget for Education in Soviet Russia this year was £140,000,000 (reckoning the rouble at 5d.). What has Mr. Fisher, who cannot make up his mind to let the law to make schooling compulsory under 14 come into operation, to say to that. In Russia this year schooling is compulsory from 8 to 16 years. Next year the age limit goes up to 20 years. All education establishments, including the Universities, are free in Russia—free books and

meals are provided at school for all. Lectures and instructive amusements are attached to all the factories for the adults, as well as for the young; 7,000 new village schools, 3,000 second-grade schools and 12 universities have been opened in a year beside innumerable popular universities, evening classes and educational clubs and study circles.

SOCIALISM THROUGH PARLIAMENT OR SOVIET?

DEBATE between E. C. FAIRCHILD, (Late Editor of "The Call,") and J. P. HODGSON, (B. S. P. Executive.) ESSEX HALL, Essex Street, Strand, W.C. 2. on THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2nd, at 8 p.m.

Chairman—A. A. Watts, L.C.C.

ADMISSION FREE. Reserved seats, Tickets 1s. and 6d. from B.S.P., 21a, Maiden Lane, Strand, W.C.2. B.S.P., etc Branch Sec, and at the door

THE SPUR TO COMMUNISM.

September Features:

Rev. E.B.A. Somerset, M.A. on "Christ or Lenin?"

"Australian Bolsheviks' Manifesto."

"Anarchists and Bolshevism" by Guy A. Aldred.

"Prison Reform."

Editor's "To A Schoolmaster," "Reconstruction," etc. etc.

Post Free 2½d.

Ann. Sub. 2s. 6d.

5 years bound volume, cloth, gilt lettered, June 1914

—May 1919, post free 10s.

Order from Rose Witcop, 17, Richmond Gdns.,

Shepherds Bush, London, W. 12.

FOR 2/6 POST FREE

Three Marvellous Publications ON BIRTH-CONTROL.

Thoughtful workingclass people are following the lead of the upper classes and getting wise on limitation of family.

From J. W. GOTT, Sec., LIBERATOR LEAGUE 61, DORSET ST., BRADFORD.

LEANEY'S LTD. WHOLESALE NEWSAGENT.

City Agent for the Workers' Dreadnought 9 & 10, ST. BRIDE'S AVENUE, E.C.4 Late City and Suburban Publishing Co.)

Phone: Central 3820. Established 1855

TOYE & CO.,

57, THEOBALDS ROAD, LONDON, W.C.

Sole Manufacturer of

Banners and Flags for Demonstrations.

Metal and Enamelled Badges for all Societies.

Medals, Celluloid and Buttons.

Flags for Charity Collection Days.

MISCELLANEOUS ADVERTISEMENTS.

Classified advertisements: One penny per word Displayed advertisements: 7s. 6d. per inch.

Pre-pay and send to Manager, "Workers' Dreadnought," 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

FAMILY LIMITATION DOCTRINE. Post free, 1½d.—Malthusian League, 48, Broadway, Westminster

Why not Unemployment Benefit for ALL Children until they are strong enough to work and old enough to vote? (Advert.)

HOLIDAY CAMP, Newdigate, Surrey, for health holidays. Good food, and beautiful scenery. 30/- per week inclusive. Vacancies from Sept. 8th. Send stamp for particulars.

WANTED.—Artists and Instrumentalists willing to offer services for Concert to be held at 400, Old Ford Road, E., on Sunday, October 12th, please communicate with S. Young, 69, Salmon Lane, E. 14.

READ

"THE RED DAWN," a Monthly Magazine for Young Workers. Monthly, TWOPENCE.

Printed by The Cosmo Printing Co., 14, Little Howland Street, W. for the responsible Editor, and published by the W.S.F. at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.