KNOWLEDGE MUST PRECEDE ALL INTELLIGENT ACTION

ORGANISE

# THE WORKER

EDUCATE

THE ORGAN OF NATIONAL WORKERS COMMITTEES.

A TONIC FOR THE HOPELESS, A SCOURGE FOR THE SPINELESS.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Edited by JOHN S. CLARKE.

No. 135. 25th JUNE, 1921 Price 2d.

# An Interview with Havelock Wilson:

## A STUDY IN WRIGGLING.

### By S. PARK (of Glasgow Seamen's Vigilance Committee).

Great unrest is at present agitating the rank and file of the N.S. & F.U. throughout the country.

In Glasgow that unrest found expression quite recently in a resolution, passed by acclamation, calling upon Mr J. Havelock Wilson, the Gen. President, and Mr Walsh, the Scottish Organiser, to resign. More recently still, another resolution was carried demanding that Mr Wilson come to Glasgow, or, failing that, that he consent to receive a deputation from Glasgow.

As a result of these resolutions, a meeting of the members was hurriedly called for noon on Friday last to elect a deputation,—three firemen and three seamen,—to proceed to Edinburgh by the one o'clock train, to interview Mr Wilson.

Our instructions from the members were brief but to the point. About four o'clock we were conducted into one of the rooms of the suite occupied by Mr Wilson at the Waverley Hotel. The Waverley is rather a decent place; but, of course, as any hotel must seem rather heavenly to men who have grown up in ships' fo'c'sles, we are quite prepared to admit the possibility of there being hotels even better than the Waverley. Whether or no, we hasten to assure our fellow-members that there is no likelihood of any person living in the Waverley being called upon to endure the slightest discomfort or inconvenience.

A few minutes after we had seated ourselves, Mr Wilson came in. He greeted us very pleasantly. He was pleased to meet us, and glad that we had come for a friendly interview. We corrected him by saying that we had come for an interview. Having rectified that little inaccuracy, we got down to business. We told him that his members in Glasgow were very anxious to meet him. Surely, we said, he would make the short journey to Glasgow to attend to the business of his members, seeing that he had come all the way from London to attend the Conference in Edinburgh. But we had come to do more than invite him to Glasgow .We had a question to put to him, and were going to tell him very frankly why we thought that he, and his officials who thought as he did, were no longer suitable persons to look after the interests of the seamen of this country.

We said he had let the seamen down. He had let Labour down. He was dividing the forces of Labour and, consciously or unconsciously, was doing the work of the employers. He was too friendly with the shipowners for our liking. At one time he was regarded by them as a dangerous man. During his case against the Shipping Federation in 1913, F. E. Smith told him so. It was also stated bluntly then that the interests of the Federation were antagonistic to the interests of the union. But things had changed since then. Nowadays shipowners and seamen and firemen rubbed shoulders and clinked glasses at annual dinners, for which the seamen and firemen paid. And that "glorious condition of affairs" was recognised by the shipowners to be due to Mr J. Havelock Wilson. Not only that, but in all his latest speeches he had been defending and whitewashing the shipowners. We did not like that kind of business; and we objected to him doing it.

From that we went into the question of wages. He made no fuss about our reduction. Or, if he did, it was only in order to compel us to accept it. At the same time, he was quite willing to accept an increase for himself of £250 per annum.

Our reduction leaves us with a wage equal to about £5 per month pre-war value. His increase leaves him with £1,000 per year, free of income tax. Did he think that that was as it should be? And what about the ballot? What about the papers which he says had never been through the ballot box! And why had we not been given the actual figures? He had said that he thought that if any undue influence had been used, he would have no hesitation in scrapping the ballot and ordering his members to return to work at the reduced rates, pending another ballot. What about balloting the women? Was that undue influence?

What about the shipowners' profits? In his "great" speech at Brussels he had said that all this talk about the millions made by the shipowners was a lot of rot. The millions were mythical. They had never existed. We told him that C. Money, in "Triumph of Nationalisation," says that they made £350,000,000 in the first 31 months of the war. And how did the shipowners fare with regard to compensation for ships lost by enemy action? Did they have to wait until Germany paid up? Again we quoted Ch. Money. They had been paid £104,000,000 during the war for the loss of ships which had cost £51,000,000. How had he looked after the interest of his members? What compensation had been paid to those who lost their effects through enemy action? They had received no compensation up till now.

From that we turned to the Chinese question. He stated recently that the number of Chinese engaged on British ships in the U. K. had decreased by 50 per cent. He was creating the impression that the Chinese problem was becoming less grave. Did he include in his estimate the Chinese joining British ships outside of U.K.? We told him that the book which we had quoted before said that Lascars and Asiatics had increased from a small but not precisely known figure in 1872, until in 1912 there were 47,000.

He always made things look as favourable to the shipowners as he could. Take the effect of the raising of the load line. Speaking on that subject lately, he had said that there had been a decrease in the number of ships lost since the load line was raised: A very considerable decrease. That statement was calculated to give one the impression that the raising of the load line had actually increased the stability of the ships. In view of what he had said, we asked him what he thought of the following Board of Trade figures relating to the steamships which foundered during the seven years before and the seven years after the raising of the load line:—

From 1899 to 1905, 72 ships foundered; lives lost, 356. Annual average loss, 10 ships, 51 lives. From 1906 to 1912, 78 ships foundered; lives lost, 483; annual average loss, 11 ships, 69 lives.

We drew his attention to the fact that sailing ships were hardly affected by the raising of the load line; and that the figures related exclusively to steamships which had foundered. We reminded him that he and his officials were paid to organise the seamen in this country. They had not done so. They were not doing so. Not only were men going through the Federation. His officials advised the men to go through the Fed. And their argument was that if the members of the N.S. & F.U. did not go through the Fed. to get the jobs, the members of the B.S.U. would.

We told him that if we were to get our jobs through the Fed., there was no need for us to keep paying the officials of the Union the salaries we were paying them. And we wanted him to understand that we did not go to sea in order to provide him with a position and a salary. That our interests were more to us than his interests, or the interests of any other official; and that if he stood in the way of our interests, we would have to seek ways and means to remove him.

Closely connected with the subject of the Fed., was the question of amalgamation with the B.S.U.

If we were in one union, as we ought to be, we would be better able to keep all the men away from the Federation. We were led to believe that members of both unions were on the point of being balloted about amalgamation; and that he was the man who was mainly, if not solely, responsible for the proceedings being dropped.

Amalgamation was vital to the members of both unions, and we wanted to know who stopped it, and why.

From that we turned to the political fund. We told him that we had been informed that he had only voted once in the House of Commons in 1920: and on that occasion he voted against a motion brought by the Labour Party calling attention to the lack of discipline in the Crown forces in Ireland and asking for an inquiry into the nature and extent of reprisals in Ireland.

These were some of our reasons, we told him, why we thought that he was no longer entitled to the confidence of the seamen of this country.

While all this was being said, Mr Wilson never once interrupted. He just lay back in his chair and listened attentively.

His reply, fellow seamen, is worth studying. Read it carefully. Note also how he began his defence. Almost his first word, addressed to the member who had spoken, was "were you ever in the B.S.U.?" "Yes," was the answer. "Why did you join the B.S.U., and why are you now in the N.S. and F.U.?" were the next questions. One of the members of the deputation objected to this personal attack, and said that that was how Mr Wilson had dealt with Mr Jenkins.

The member to whom the questions were addressed, however, said he was quite willing to answer Mr Wilson's questions. He got a job on a ship, he said, not knowing and not caring whether she was B.S.U. or National. He named the ship. When he left the ship he ceased to be a member of the B.S.U. He joined an Australian ship later on. When he came back from Australia he transferred to the National, because, he went on, if he wanted to sail in Australian ships or American ships that was his business and not Mr Wilson's. He claimed the right for all seamen to sail on any ship belonging to any country, on which they could get a job, without asking permission of Mr Wilson or any other official.

Mr Wilson did not seem to derive any great amount of satisfaction from the reply.

Regarding his friendship for the shipowners, he said that it was foolish to think that you could not fight a man and yet be on friendly terms with him. He had fought the shipowners for years. But he had reversed his policy after the 1911 strike. And the progress we had made, he said, justified the change of policy. Questioned as to the progress we had made, he said that our present wage was £1 or 30/- per month better than our pre-war wage. We challenged that statement. He in turn did not agree that the Australian seamen had made progress.

He justified his acceptance of the £1,000 per year, because, as he said, of the many years' service which he had given to the seamen practically for nothing. Surely the seamen were sports, and were not ungrateful. Besides, look at the salary which J. H. Thomas got. And our union was one of the greatest in the country!

He was rather touchy about that thousand quidlets. Can it be that he is not quite convinced that he has earned them? Asked if he would agree to a reduction seeing that our wages was reduced, he said that if he were asked to accept a reduction he would consider the matter. And if he thought fit he would accept it; if not, he would resign. (A fodder basis is all right for the "men of the sea," as he so often calls his members. But Mr J. Havelock Wilson is not having any, thank you.)

What he had said about the shipowners' profits was: If the profits of the shipowners for a period of 60 years were calculated, it would be found that the shipowners had not made 5 per cent. profit. Lucky shipowners, to have such a considerate, valiant champion! He did not deal with Money's figures. Money, he said, could juggle with figures.

We would take Money's word before his, we told him. Regarding the compensation paid to the shipowners he was dumb. He did not readily admit that his members had received no compensation for loss of effects, however. He told us what he had said to Lloyd George and what L. G. had said to him. We told him we were not disputing what had been paid to widows and orphans of men killed by enemy action. He compared his attitude on reparations with the attitude of the Labour Party. That did not interest us in the meantime, we told him; stick to the point. He wanted to know where we got our information. He wriggled like an eel. We herded him like a pack herding a drove of cattle, and finally he admitted that what we had said was true. He also referred to himself as a Labour leader!

The ballot, he said, was in favour of accepting the reduction. All the ballot papers, even the hundreds which had never, according to Mr Walsh, been through a ballot box, were included in the total figures. That statement did not agree with a statement which had been made by Mr Walsh in Glasgow some time ago. We pointed that out, and in consequence were treated to an exhibition of timidity on the part of Mr Walsh that was painful to witness. The branches were notified as to the actual number in favour of accepting the reduction, said Mr Wilson. Mr M'Phee, our branch secy., said he had not received them.

In Mr Wilson's opinion the sending of the post cards to the women of the Mersey was not using undue influence. He defended his friend Mr L. George in connection with the raising of the load line. We told him we were not discussing Mr L. George. It was his, Mr Wilson's, speech that we had referred to. He challenged our figures as number of ships which had foundered. We repeated our figures, so that he would know exactly what he was challenging. They can be found in Cmd 8204, 1916. Glasgow members will find it in the Mitchell Library. He stuck to his statement that the number of Chinese engaged on British ships in the U.K. had decreased by 50 per cent. Chinese joining British ships abroad were not included in that estimate. But the total number of Chinese on British ships had certainly decreased.

He had not known that his officials had advised the members to go through the Federation. But he knew that many shipowners refused to engage men below the terms agreed to by the union and the National Maritime Board. In fact the shipowners had threatened to expel one of their members from the Federation for offending in that respect.

Noble, much maligned shipowners.

It was such a pity that after he had made such a truthful appeal for his friends, we had to tell him that men had been offered a job through the Federation just the day before. It was to take a ship to Antwerp by the run, and the money offered was half or less than half of the amount stated on the rate card of his members.

The next point was amalgamation with the B.S.U. He had no objection to the members of the B.S.U. He objected to Mr Lewis and Mr Shinwell coming into the union. And he considered it his duty before amalgamation took place, if it ever took place, to tell his members exactly what kind of persons Mr Lewis and Mr Shinwell were. They were not seamen, and they were both after seats in the House of Commons. He treated us to stories of incident in the careers of both men. But he was not responsible for the amalgamation proceedings being stopped. The matter had been decided at the last annual general meeting. He admitted that there were paid officials in the "National" who were not seamen, and that he himself had a seat in the House of Commons. But it was quite evident that he was not anxious for amalgamation. If the breach in our ranks is to be closed, it will be done if and when the rank and file take a hand in the game themselves.

About his activities or inactivities in the House during 1919 and 1920 he was silent.

We then proceeded to ask him a few questions. His replies are not without interest. Here they are:—

What wages are paid to "Capt." Tupper and Father Hopkins, and what work do they perform for the union?

"Capt." Tupper gets £7 per week. He negotiates. He has never failed to negotiate successfully. He had held the fort at Cardiff. Some men don't like Tupper because he is too clever for them. Father Hopkins gets no salary, only expenses. He has a private income. His type of mind is invaluable. He collates statistics. The union owes a debt of gratitude to both men for the work they have done. Both men brought into the movement by Mr Wilson, and they will stay in as long as a majority of the members are satisfied with them.

What is cost of annual dinners, and why are shipowners invited to them? Bringing the shipowners to them costs less than £10, and the dinners themselves less than £100. Mr Brackenridge is, or was until lately, at Port Said. Why are his wages still being charged against the West of Scotland? The Glasgow members did not like Mr Breckenridge; he had been removed, but he had not been sacked.

How are union funds invested? They are invested in Housing bonds and Exchequer bonds, and bearing good interest.

Did he tell Mr Shinwell that Glasgow men were a lot of thieves and bums. No. He may have used strong language about some men in London and Liverpool, but not about Glasgow men. Did he lend Mr Houghton £4,000 on condition that his men went back to work? No, he did not. Mr Houghton came to him for advice. He laid Mr Houghton's case before his Finance Committee, and they decided to lend Mr Houghton £4,000 on condition that the money was not used to prolong the strike.

Didn't he think that he was going against the principles of Trade Unionism when he sent word to his members to man the ships and ignore the strike of the cooks and stewards? No, he did not think so. He had given a ruling as chairman that the cooks and stewards had the right to strike or not. But they would have no right, if they did decide to strike, to expect support from the unions which had decided to accept the reductions; therefore he was quite entitled to instruct his members to ignore the strike of the cooks and stewards.

Some six months ago a resolution was sent to London drawing attention to the fact that the members of the Glasgow district thought they had not enough representatives on the E.C. Did Mr Wilson think that they ought to have two men on the E.C.? Certainly. He did not see why they should not have two men on the E.C. In that case, why was no reply sent to their resolution? He had never seen it.

There are other things, fellow seamen, he has never seen. He is not big enough. He has no vision. And it is true to-day as ever it was, where there is no vision the people perish. Some of us went to Edinburgh expecting to see a man bearing some traces of a former greatness. We were disappointed. We found him little, petulant, slippery, flaming out in anger at contradiction, yet ready to flatter if flattery would serve his ends. His officials are but puppets in his hands. He himself will be as wax in the hands of the shipowners.

Comrades of the sea, you have no choice. Wilson must go. We have sweltered with you in bug-infested fo'castles in the tropics; we have shivered with you in the North Atlantic; we have sweated with you in the glare of the furnaces; we have lain out on the yards with you in the blackness of the night; and with one voice we tell you—Wilson must go. You have no choice. For your own sake, for the sake of your women and bairns, for the sake of the glad days yet to be, for the sake of your comrades of the East and the West, the seamen of Australia and America, who are fighting in the forefront of your battle to-day, for the sake of the seamen of all lands, and of the world-wide marine workers' union that will yet be ours—Wilson must go.

---

There are thousands hacking around in the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root.—Henry D. Thoreau.

# The Sympathic Apathetic I.L.P.

## By WILLIAM GALLACHER.

That the I.L.P. is in a bad way there cannot be the slightest doubt. However much they may boast about their membership, it is becoming increasingly clear that the biggest membership conceivable is going to be of very little use while every individual of the Party is at variance with the rest on the question of policy.

They are all agreed, certainly, that the Coalition is as bad as bad can be, that it is continually doing things that the pure-souled I.L.Pers. would never dream of doing. "These things we wouldn't do," they cry with one voice, but then it isn't what they wouldn't do that counts, but what are they prepared to do when the workers give them power?

Put that question and you get Babel for an answer.

They daren't discuss the things that matter, so they discuss the things that don't matter.

This is pathetically proven in Willie Stewart's contribution to the "Forward" the other week. Willie plaintively asserts that he is proud of the I.L.P., but the assertion is suspiciously like that of a man who is rapidly losing his faith, and feels constrained to shriek his belief abroad in the hope of reassuring himself rather than to convince others.

Now anyone will admit willingly that the rank and file of the I.L.P. will strive as hard as any to assist the miners in their heroic fight to keep up the status of the workers, but when we find Willie Stewart rushing into print and bragging of the Party (with a view of obtaining a political dividend) giving its halls to the miners, raising subscriptions, and helping to feed the miners, our minds go back a few years to the unemployment crisis of 1907-8, and we remember that the claim of the Salvation Army at that time for their work on behalf of the unemployed is the same as is now being made for the I.L.P. by Willie Stewart.

Now just as no one will deny that the I.L.Pers. have helped the miners, so no one will deny that the Salvation Army assisted the unemployed in the crisis referred to, but the mere fact of having philanthropically assisted the workers in a time of unemployment or strike is no guarantee that either of the bodies (between which there is a growing similarity) is capable of abolishing capitalism, and by that means putting an end to the conditions that make industrial strife with all its consequent suffering inevitable. Proud of the I.L.P., yet filled with a spirit of gloomy pessimism, Willie Stewart harks back to the past and sighs, "Oh, if only the workers had voted Labour last election things might have been so different." True, Willie, and suppose we now discuss what would have happened if Napoleon had won the battle of Waterloo. It will surely take us somewhere or nowhere. Let us face realities and deal with realities. These "what might have beens" are the veriest folly. The outstanding fact to be faced is this: The Labour Party, which includes the I.L.P., has no policy now, and was without one in 1918.

In Bridgeton Maxton was Labour candidate, and claimed to be fiercely left wing. Well do I remember the demonstration in St. Andrews Hall, when Jimmie brought down the house with a declaration of his Bolshevik faith.

Jimmie was a fire-eating revolutionary, and was heart and soul opposed to half measures. But still Jimmie was a Labour candidate. Was his voice the voice of the Labour Party? Far from it. Up in Cathcart there was another Labour candidate, and the breath of life to him was moderate reform. Moderate reform plus the trial of the Kaiser and a fair indemnity was what he stood for, and he claimed to be speaking in the name of the Labour Party. What could these men do, in the midst of all the confusion arising out of the war, but make confusion worse confounded?

How is it to-day? How many different voices speak in the name of the Labour Party and the I.L.P.? Is Thomas an acceptable man, and is his book, "When Labour Rules," an acceptable outline of the work to be done by the Labour Party in the event of it gaining power? If he isn't, who then can speak for it and explain its policy so that we might understand it?

Is Macdonald right when he opposes the very thought of revolution, or is Dollan the spokesman of the I.L.P. when he stupidly talks of the I.L.P. being the only revolutionary body in Britain?

Or perhaps Wedgewood is the man, when he says that a Labour Government will introduce the Capital Levy and Taxation of Land Values. What an unspeakably miserable medley, each one playing out of tune with the others, while the edifice of capitalism is crumbling all around and threatening to bury the workers under its ruins.

Face realities and admit that voting is going to take the workers no whither. Faced with a crisis, the outcome of which will either be intensified slavery or emancipation, the one hope of the workers to-day is sound industrial organisation. Miners, engineers, wood workers, cotton workers, railwaymen, dockers, and agricultural labourers have got to march together if they would surmount the obstacles that bar their way on the road to freedom.

Those who are in earnest in the fight against capitalism will throw themselves eagerly into the work of forwarding such organisation.

In every district Workshop Committees should be set up for the purpose of drawing together all the scattered forces of the workers. From one end of the country to the other the workers must be rallied to make a stand against the desperate attack that is being made on their present miserable standard of life.

The National Administrative Council of the Workshop Committees is vigorously endeavouring to overtake this work, and should receive the support of all intelligent workers.

We are living in strenuous times. Times full of menace, yet full of promise for the whole working class. In such a time the place-hunter is a danger to the cause of Labour. Sensationalism or theatricalism serves no purpose. What is wanted is steady organisation and a clear understanding of the work that lies before us. Much there is to be done. Let us get together and do it.

# Dope and Dubb Phrases

By A. W.

**"If personal gain is abolished, there will be no incentive to progress."**

This is the longest standing of the fallacies which are accepted by Henry without analysis. What it really means is that the only way by which the capitalist can satisfy his desire for personal gain is to provide the worker with the knowledge that if he does not fulfil the wishes of his master he will starve, and see his wife and family starve. That is **some** incentive to work.

Of course, the hope of personal gain is dangled before the worker also just as progress is obtained from a donkey by dangling a carrot at his nose, but the worker never touches it by working. It is only by becoming a merchant or employer, and picking other people's brains and labour that personal gain is obtainable.

Those who swallow this "dope" phrase no doubt occasionally need a doctor, whom they will pay only while they remain sick, and stop paying immediately they are cured. If he advises them to have their appendix removed they will pay two doctors, and the more cutting and scraping of the internals the doctors advise the more they receive in payment. So if doctors are only actuated by personal gain you'd be better to adopt the old kingly method of chopping off their heads of they did **not** cure you. G. B. S. deals at length with this aspect in the "Doctor's Dilemma."

The Editor has frequently pointed out great world geniuses who died in poverty, and at the present day the leading scientists have been compelled to organise themselves into a union to resist exploitation by the social parasites. I know of one professor of astronomy who does his lecturing work, rushes back to his observatory, works constantly on improvements in the mechanism of sidereal and other clocks, and on the perfection of our knowledge of the heavens. His predecessor had to have a subscription given him to enable him to live. Then our own acquaintances, who are "conscientious objectors," who work for their employer with an energy and eagerness unequalled in any field of labour, do they do it for personal gain? Assuredly not! They do from a mistaken ideal and a betraying education, which leads them to believe they work for the community's welfare while it is only for a selfish hanger-on.

Then the crowning example to the lie is the opportunity which is at present denied to nearly two million people of working at all.

Personal gain is the curse of humanity. The only thing worth working for is social gain, and that necessitates purging the body social of its parasites and diseases, so that its members may work for its health without seeing its strength sapped from it by these malignant growths.

"More passionate than any other emotion that has stirred me through life, is my conviction that any man who has seen these things must, if he has any gift of expression, and any human pity, dedicate his brain and heart to the sacred duty of preventing another war like this. A man with a pen in his hand, however feeble it may be, must use it to tell the truth about the monstrous horror, to etch its images of cruelty into the brains of his readers, and to tear down the veils by which the leaders of the peoples try to hide its obscenities. . . .

"THERE WILL BE NO HOPE OF PEACE UNTIL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD RECOGNISE THEIR BROTHERHOOD AND REFUSE TO BE LED TO THE SHAMBLES FOR MUTUAL MASSACRE. If there is no hope of that, if, as some students of life hold, war will always happen because life is a continual warfare, and one man only lives at the expense of another, then there is no hope, and all the ideals of men striving for the progress of mankind, all the dreams of poets and the sacrifice of scientists are utterly vain and foolish, and pious men should pray God to touch this planet with a star and end the folly of it all."—Sir PHILIP GIBBS.

KNOWLEDGE MUST PRECEDE ALL INTELLIGENT ACTION
ORGANISE
# THE WORKER
EDUCATE
THE ORGAN OF NATIONAL WORKERS COMMITTEES

All communications to be sent to the Editor, National Council's Offices, 21 North Frederick Street, Glasgow, and must reach this office not later than Monday. Advertisements are received till Tuesday morning.

Communications must bear name and address of sender, not necessarily for publication.

Subscribers' Rates:—Weekly, 1d.; Quarterly, 1/1; Half-Yearly, 2/2. Post free.

JUNE 25, 1921.

## The Work of Professor Jukovsky.

Professor Jukovsky, who died recently, has left a vast scientific legacy. Of all work, achieved by him in the field of aeronautics, at the Central Auto-motor Institute of the republic, is of special world importance. Professor Jukovsky was the first to design a perfect system of aeroplane, there by offering Russian avio-works the possibility of working from a rigid design and not in the dark. Professor Jukovsky systematised the theory of the propeller and constructed one which surpassed all that modern technique possessed.

Apart from this, Professor Jukovsky invented a new design for a petrol-motor, capable of working with a maximum economy of fuel and remarkable for its durability. Professor Jukovsky, further, was the first to elaborate on an international scale the question of the most rational form for a ship. The deceased professor completed this work with the support of the Soviet Government just before his death. For the purpose of working out the best structure for a ship, Professor Jukovsky took as his models a swan and a vessel: compared them and conceived the law that the model of the ship meets with more resistance in the water than does the swan.

Basing himself on this theory he invented a vessel whose economy in fuel was 20-30 per cent. The vessel of the new structure is of great power although it has a much less powerful engine, which reduces its weight and increases its speed.

In the same manner Professor Jukovsky discovered a most advantageous form of a plough. The new plough is capable of ploughing 50 per cent. more land than other ploughs. Under the supervision of Professor Jukovosky work was conducted on the construction of the greatest aerodinamic tubes in the world to combat snow-drifts, and on the construction of large airships with 500 horse-power engines, capable of carrying 10-12 passengers. Finally, he designed a new type of boat, having a much greater speed than the ordinary boat.

## Watch Out for Him!

**(To the Editor of the "Worker.")**

WORKERS' COUNCIL, VANCOUVER, B.C.

Dear Sir,—The above organisation takes this opportunity to inform you that the Mayor of this city has just left on a protracted visit to Scotland.

We wish to inform you, that he has a distinct aversion to the working class, and on many occassions has endeavoured to prevent free speech and free assembly during the period of unemployment, which we are passing through.

The object of this letter is to advise you that he might attempt to paint such a picture as to make people believe that this Province is an Eldorado for Workers, also re his administration of this city.

Trusting you will be able to give this due publicity. Yours for all Workers.—E. HORSBURGH.

# CIGARETTE PAPERS

**By the Editor**

### Our Parliamentary Warriors.

Any I.L.Per. will tell you, reader, that all this sad world requires is a Labour majority in the House of Commons. Once that majority gets there industrial action will automatically cease, because Labour will be top-dog and Capitalist Imperialism, which has completely capitulated to the democratically expressed desires of the Irish, will bow to the will of the Labour Government. In the meantime there is a class war on, and Labour has to fight somehow whether it wants to or not. The bosses attack first, and Labour has to—well, they call it a fight but it really isn't one. So long as the Labour organisations are constituted as they are at present and dominated by the grand new Labour bourgeoisie, they never will be able to fight. Fighting means action—a Roland for an Oliver—not merely taking a gruelling but giving one. Never a whisper of discouragement shall the "Worker" send forth to the heroic miners who have, at the time of writing, stubbornly replied per ballot to the brutal bullies who are starving them, but are the miners fighting? Is Labour capable of putting up a fight? No! Organised pacifism, sullen resentment, stubborn quiescence, anything you like—that is what Labour indulges in at times like these. As Willie Stewart wrote in last week's "Forward":—

> "Industrial action is not aggressive, it is defensive, and in the nature of things has to be so. It defends established wage conditions and standards of life. In doing so it renders great and necessary service to the workers, but it is not an attacking force. It does not carry the war into the enemies' country."

Well, it is high time it did carry the war into the enemies' country. But how?

✣ ✣ ✣

### Let Us Weep.

In Willie's way? By Willie's method? There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth if it does so. It is not aggressive, says W. S., it is defensive, and "in the nature of things it has to be so." Granted, but Willie's way is not to interfere with the "nature of things"—oh, dear no! Willie was a pioneer, and history has a lamentable tale to tell of pioneers—ninety per cent. of them become fossilised with the ideas they pioneered. Whatever fighting strength the rank and file possesses is sapped by the leech-like bureaucrats who control the unions. This is part of the "nature of things." The prehistoric basis upon which the antediluvian structure of Trade Unionism is built is another factor in "the nature of things." The treacherous officials, by virtue of the power they have usurped, lead the rank and file into blind alleys and bottomless pits, spreading not only confusion but demoralisation—that again is a fragment of the "nature of things."

But don't attempt to alter the nature of things, says Willie, for the nature of things is now hoary, and old age must be respected. Such is the sanctity of senility. Let these abuses continue and get that "Labour majority" in the pow-wow wig-wam of Westminster:—

> "The I.L.P. believes that only by uniting the workers can Socialism ever be achieved. And it believes that the workers can be more easily and more effectively united on the political field than on the industrial field, yet it lends its aid to every industrial effort either towards unity or progress. . . . A House of Commons containing 400 working men would not have rejected the recommendations of the Sankey Commission. It would have bettered them. The mines would to-day be national property. The political and industrial forces of Labour would to-day be in a position to work together, and all these attacks upon the workers' standard of life, taking miners, textile workers, railwaymen, and engineers successively, would have been met not by strikes deliberately engineered by employers in the middle of an unemployment crisis, but would have been met or forestalled by counter attacks on capitalism backed by legislative authority wielded by Labour itself."

And that's that! Four hundred critturs like Arthur Henderson, J. H. Thomas, Jack Mills, W. Adamson, Tom Myers, John Hodge—look at 'em, reader, for God's sake look at 'em—delivering "counter attacks on capitalism backed by legislative authority wielded by Labour itself." Four hundred medicine men, at four hundred per annum, voted to "Power" by liberals, tories, catholics, protestants, communists, socialists, health faddists, sex experts, free traders, tariff reformers, wait-and-seers, and fourteen-pointers.

There's a picture for you. The graphic portrayal of the ancient art of swallowing wonders and excreting miracles. Gallant four hundred! "Oh, the great charge they made, while all the world wondered." Very nearly one hundred of those "Labour representatives" are already there, reader, nearly one hundred of them. What can sixty or seventy of them do?

✣ ✣ ✣

### 'Tis the Voice of Mac.

According to J. R. Macdonald, and he ought to know because he has written books about it, they can "form an opposition" while waiting for the three hundred odd. Same issue "Forward":—

> "For the time being, the British Labour Party has the simplest task, and that is to form an Opposition. Every time it hits the Government, its gains go to itself not to another party. Therefore, it ought to keep on hitting it. No praising, no apologising, no gloves—a vigilant and merciless opposition, training its own men all the time in political warfare, demanding from them that Parliament shall be their first concern and acting ruthlessly to those who will not put their backs into the work."

My God! Fancy! They've been polishing the backsides of their pants on the seats of Westminster for donkey's years and never thought of such a "simple task" before. They must "form an opposition." Up to date, of course, they hadn't done so. Proof in a minute.

✣ ✣ ✣

### Facetious Thomas.

We really like Tom Johnston because, in spite of everything, he knows how to clout hypocrites and liars—when they speak for Capitalism. He gets facetious, however, at the expense of the Communist Party who have circularised sundry I.L.P.ers, among others, on the question of free speech. We haven't seen the circular so cannot discuss the point with justice. But Tom is keen on the Labour majority too.

If you believe that a dirty dog like J. H. Thomas, for example, will betray the working class inside the House, as lustily as he does outside, and you consequently determine to oppose his return, Tom will write "Loud capitalist cheers" when he mentions the fact in "Forward."

In his paragraph on the C. P. circular, he mentions Neil Maclean's free speech organisation, which brings us to the point. We don't know much about Neil's organisation, so don't intend to criticise it. We want to stick to that "Labour majority." In the I.L.P. organ of Birmingham, the "Town Crier," for June 10, appears a report from the I.L.P. "Commons Reporter." He deals with the "infamous prosecutions of the Communists" and the fight put up on their behalf in the House of Commons by some Labour and Liberal

M.P.'s. One mustn't forget that these "infamous prosecutions" are intended to deter critics of Capitalism during the boss attack on Labour. The bosses begin hostilities and the Government obligingly brings out a muzzle called E.P.A. or E.R.A. to stop the mouths of "agitators." It is, without doubt, absolutely infamous that such weapons should be used against Labour. Well, after sufficient pressure has been brought to bear upon "Labour's representatives," a fight in the "House" begins **over two months after the Act is passed**, and our sixty or seventy stalwarts of Labour, the advance guard of Willie's gallant four hundred, engage in the class struggle. And, according to the I.L.P. reporter, this is how they do it:—

"In the House of Commons last Thursday about half a dozen Labour members put up a very good fight against the continuation of the Regulations under the Emergency Powers Act. Maclean, Clynes, Lawson, Swann, and Tom Shaw all spoke strongly, and they were backed up by George Barnes and Robert Cecil, in addition to Kenworthy and some of the Free Liberals. But there ought to have been a demonstrations of strength on such an occasion; instead, when Clynes was speaking, there were not, so far as one could observe from the Press Gallery, **half a dozen Labour members present.** When Clynes finished I left the Gallery to attend the weekly meeting of M.P.'s held in one of the committee rooms, under the auspices of the I.L.P. Information Committee. Ben Spoor, the chairman, was duly seated in the armchair at the head of the horse-shoe table. To his right sat Ernest Hunter, who is acting as temporary secretary to the committee. To his left sat Miss Wedgwood, who is doing much of the work of the committee. Otherwise the room WAS—EMPTY! Where were our M.P.s? ATTENDING A MEETING OF THE WOMEN'S UNIONIST COUNCIL, which occupied a committee room a few doors down the corridor."

✣ ✣ ✣

## Do It Now.

Neither the would-be "first class" travellers of the Labour Party nor the soup kitchen Socialists of the I.L.P. can help Labour against its panic-stricken, cowardly and merciless foe—Capitalism. Labour must help itself. Labour must cease to organise for defence only and **organise for aggression.** By kicking out the limpets and leeches from its vitals and linking up into some form of militant homogeniety (preferably that outlined from time to time in these pages) the "nature of things," which admittedly retards its progress and renders it impotent, can be so altered or annihilated that Labour will not only be able to "carry the fight into the enemies' country," but emerge from that country the conqueror.

✣ ✣ ✣

## Among the Free Lovers.

Elizabeth Macgregor sued her husband, William Macgregor, for divorce last week. In a drunken rage he knocked her teeth out, and after deserting her lived with Lucy Acton as her husband. Readers will be relieved to know that this creature is not a Bolshevik but a Christian "evangelist." Last week we commented on the "honourable and gallant" officer, Maurice Platt (who recently died for his country's good) who supported a private prostitute for two years at a cost of £14,000. We might also have mentioned the delectable case of Reginald De Beer, an undoubted anti-Bolshevik, who admired royalty so deeply that he collected a select audience one night to witness his dalliance with an Indian princess, the wife of another man. Both of them were—but read the report in the "Daily Record," 8/6/21:—

"Lord Mersey—Were you alone?—No; a friend was with me, a Mr Maud, who had told me of the goings on. Mr Maud is now in Scotland.

The petitioner said that when he looked in at the window he saw his wife on the bed with De Beer. Both were naked. He went back into the road, and met Constable Gardner, and brought him back to the flat. They found the couple still in the same position.

Lord Mersey—Did the policeman also climb up the railings?—Yes.

Lord Mersey—Did the co-respondent say anything when you spoke to your wife?—Yes, he got off the bed.

Lord Mersey—Still stark naked?—Yes, and came towards the window, and said—"This is a bit thick," or words to that effect."

"A bit thick" without a doubt; 'tis a wonder the industry could stand it.

Another uncompromising detester of Lenin and Trotsky is Lady Brisco. Hubby is suing for divorce. He opened one of her letters to a friend one day, and then opened both of his eyes. You'll find the whole letter written by the blue-blooded lady in last Friday's newspapers: It is to her paramour, one Mr Campsie. The intellectual calibre of some of our "superiors" can be gauged from the following passages:—

"How much you cheered me. I was feeling like nothing on earth when I came to the Queen's, and in a few minutes felt a warm and comfy and lovely feeling.

My darling, I adore you more and more. Your photograph sits on my lap waiting to come into my hand for the night.

How I wish it was your own dear hand I could hold.

Goodbye, Campsie sweetheart.

Bobbles."

We've kept guinea-pigs that exhibited greater intelligence than "Bobbles." Another item in the evidence reads:—

"A parlour-maid said that after she had taken tea to Mr Campsie's room she had occasion to return, and saw Lady Brisco in her night attire, with a very thin Japanese dressing gown over it, standing near Mr Campsie, who was in his pyjamas."

And while the beastly upper class indulge this sort of thing at nightime, and spend thousands of pounds on Ascot gowns, and buy up seats at Polo matches at £25 a piece, we find that hypocritical humbug, "Hal 'o' the Wynd," advocating in the "Evening Times" the acceptance of reduced wages by the workers on the strength of an argument like this:—

"So we have to learn by practical experience the great truth that the richest man is the man who has the fewest needs. Economic pressure is teaching us that every day. We are doing without many things which are, after all, closely akin to luxuries.

Let us do without cheerfully."

The "**us**" of course is the worker—the loafing upper class in their gilded brothels will take bloody good care **they** won't go without—and "Hal o' the Wynd" won't either.

✣ ✣ ✣

## Can You Beat It?

Sir Hamar Greenwood's political boss recently snotted off the representative churchmen who signed a protest against the British Government's indiscriminate massacres in Ireland. Last Thursday he attended service in the chapel at Caerwylan, and when the pastor "requested Mr Lloyd George to deliver a brief address," the most sinister figure in contemporary history responded with:—

"It was only too true that these were times of care and anxiety.

The present unrest was greater and more general than had followed any war, and their only hope was summed up in the words of the eloquent discourse they had just heard—'God is Love.'"

✣ ✣ ✣

## Its Manifestation.

After picturing the words "God is Love" falling from the lips of David Lloyd George, read the following paragraph from "The Nation and Athenaeum" of June 11, 1921:—

"I have before me a signed copy of a statement made by an Irish lady known to one of my colleagues. Her house was destroyed in an 'official reprisal.' The act, therefore, is not one of the things which Lord Fitzalan, the Chief Executive Officer in Ireland, describes as the 'horrible crimes' of the Black and Tans. Its joint authors were the Government of England and certain regular officers and soldiers of the British Army. It was carried out in revenge for an ambush which took place fifteen miles away, and while her mother was very ill, and at times delirious. The narrative was taken from her sister's lips, and her main testimony was as follows:

'While clearing out the articles allowed, my sister saw an officer go into her bedroom, adjoining the kitchen, turn back the clothes, and putting his hand into his pocket produce a handful of rifle bullets and place them in the bed. In a few minutes he again entered that room, and picking up the ammunition he had placed there, took it to another officer, telling him that he had 'found it in a bed.' In the presence of the officer my sister told him she had seen him put it there only a few minutes previously. The incident passed off without comment by the Officer in Command. A few moments later another officer entered the same room and, picking up my sister's new shoes, carried them to the lorry. While she was carrying out food and clothing there was wholesale looting, practically altogether by officers. She demanded her shoes from the officer she had seen taking them and other articles, but he only sneered at her. She called the Commanding Officer and told him the circumstances. The officer denied that he had taken anything, and she asked the Commanding Officer to compel him to go to the lorry with her. The three then went to the lorry and found the shoes, her hat, and one or two other things lying there quite openly. The Commanding Officer ordered them to be returned to her. She also saw them take silver-plated knives, forks, and spoons, fine bed linen, a new suit—my father's—and other articles which they retained.

When the hour was up doors were closed and windows shuttered; bombs were placed in the house; the military retired to a safe distance, and when the sturdy little home that had stood there for more than two hundred years went up in dust and debris, the soldiers sent up cheer after cheer. They then drove away, taking a puppy belonging to my sister with them, and cheering as they went.'"

✣✣✣

## BONES.

Sir J. Lorne MacLeod recently expressed the hope that the Prince of Wales "may visit Iona, where lies the bones of his earliest Scottish ancestors."

With all due respect to that amiable member of foreign royalty directly concerned, we beg leave to doubt this statement as to the whereabouts of his ancestral bones.

As far as can be ascertained the ancestors of the heir-apparent to the English throne were products of Hanover, Coburg-Saalfeld, Brunswick-Luneburg. Brandenburg-Anspach, Teck, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and Saxe-Gotha (that's a nasty one. It reminds one of the air raids!) Either these ancestral bones have immigrated into Scotland from the above-menmentioned places or these bones are not the ones in question. Perhaps we had better go even further back.

Going back 300 years a "loyal" (?) Scot would triumphantly ferret out the fact that the P.o.W.'s great-great- (seven of these) grandfather's wife was on her maternal side a grand-daughter of James VI., who was perhaps a son of Mary Queen of Scots.

The "loyal one," having tracked his bones so far, and being quite sure that the P.o.W. is full of true Scottish Stuart blood, is now confronted with the fact that no Stuart king was ever buried in Iona!

—"Liberty."

# The Organisation of Workers' Committees.

## By J. R. Campbell.

It is now a commonplace of Labour propaganda that we are living in one of the most critical periods in the history of the working class. For better or for worse the conditions of the workers for a very long time to come are going to be determined by the issue of the present struggle. The struggle is not entirely unexpected, though it has been entirely unprepared for. For a long time past the active Trade Unionists have been warning their fellows of the impending struggle, and iterating and reiterating the need for preparation. Their warnings have fallen upon deaf ears. The mass of the workers, as usual, were interested in almost everything excepting their social welfare. They were content to let the extremist prophecy to his heart's content while they slouched past in an attitude of half-cynical amusement. The result is that the leaders and the bulk of the rank and file of British Trade Unionism have been found asleep at their posts. They have been completely surprised at the mass attack of the employers. To-day they have not the faintest idea of what to do except to await the march of events with a feeling of mingled bewilderment and hopelessness. Meanwhile the attack at one sector of the front has passed beyond a mere attack on wages, and has become an attack on Trade Unionism itself. The employers in the Glasgow docks are fighting for the right to employ scab labour, even if there are thousands of Trade Unionists at the docks who previous to the strike were getting little or no work. This incident points to the logical development of the struggle. First the attack is made on the standard of life built up by Trade Unionism. Then the attack is made on the institution itself. That is the situation which we are rapidly reaching to-day. The employers are not merely prepared to strangle the further growth of Trade Unionism, but they are prepared to shatter those protective organisations of the workers to pieces and leave them helpless before the great employers' federations and combines. Faced with a situation like this our old methods of organisation built up in periods of social peace become dangerous and foolish. The old objectives for which we have struggled become largely irrelevant, while our most precious catchwords become like phrases quoted from a document of a forgotten age. In these circumstances the most disastrous thing that could happen to the Labour movement would be the failure to adapt itself to the new situation. It is either change or decay as far as the union movement is concerned. What is therefore required is a thorough overhauling of the union movement. The ruthless scrapping of all forms of structure and leadership which hinder the working class exerting its full strength in the struggle.

### THE DEFEATS AND THE REMEDIES.

If we accept that standard of judgment, then we will have no difficulty in seeing through the defects of present day industrial organisation. The machinery of unionism is machinery which creates division amongst the workers instead of creating solidarity. It secures the domination of the members by the permanent officials instead of the permanent officials by the members. Its outlook is one which treats the capitalist system as a permanent thing in human affairs instead of something which has now outlived its usefulness and is therefore rotten ripe for overthrow. It preaches class conciliation instead of class conflict, and fails to realise that power is the final arbiter in the struggle of the classes. All of those defects are removable given the necessary will amongst the advanced men of the working class. And economic conditions are forcing that will to manifest itself. "Improve your organisation for the struggle or accept defeat and slavery" is the lesson being preached by the facts of our industrial life to-day. "Woe unto the vanquished."

In order to scrap the obsolete machinery of the movement and bring it thoroughly up to date a relentless war has to be waged within the union movement against the forces of conservatism. The stick-in-the-mud attitude of conservatism is a tremendous barrier, and when it is allied with the interests of the Labour bureaucracy it is well nigh immovable. Only the most determined organisation within the movement of all the active industrial rebels will effect the reorganisation of unionism in time to save the workers from blank disaster. Those active men in Trade Unionism may not see eye to eye on all the details of social philosophy (and only a stupid and intolerant petty bourgeoise would postpone the reorganisation of Trade Unionism until they did). All that we can do is to get a measure of agreement in industrial policy around which those elements must unite. Communist, Syndicalist, S.L.Per., I.L.Per., will probably be found to agree on most of the essentials of Trade Union reorganisation, however much they may disagree in a wider sphere, and if they are to act together it must be through a rank and file organisation wide enough to embrace them all. We are far from denying the necessity of a powerful Communist Party acting as the general staff of the working class movement. But we are insisting that the immediate struggle against the reactionary influences in Trade Unionism must be carried on by an organisation wide enough to embrace all industrial rebel elements. If the industrial movement is to be controlled by the party, then the industrial groups of the party must work within this wider organisation, and fight against any tendency to drift in a direction dangerous to Communism. The party industrial groups must not imagine, however, that the non-Communist industrial rebels or the mass of the Trade Unionists are going to concede the direction of the industrial movement to the party as a "right." The only way in which the dictation of the party can be secured is by the party members displaying their ability to understand and handle situations, and to build up the moral authority of the party by showing the mass of the industrial workers that it is able to effectively lead them in a crisis. This cannot be done by manifesting a spirit of petty sectarianism to other industrial rebels, but in co-operating with them in the fight and endeavouring to secure the leadership by displaying the capacity for that leadership.

### THE BUILDING OF THE COMMITTEES.

At its inception the Workers Committee was purely a workshop organisation, and has functioned as such up till the Sheffield conference. While still adhering to the necessity for unofficial workshop organisation, especially in industries where sectionalism is prevalent, it is also anxious to mobilise those scattered forces working through the union branches. It is therefore setting up union branch groups wherever there is a group of rebels who feel the necessity for the same.

The Local Workers Committee is therefore a committee of representatives from workshop groups or a committee of union branch groups or a combination of both. It is not so much an organisation for general propaganda at the street corner as an organisation for special propaganda at the work gates or the branches. Wherever there is sufficient branch or workshop groups in an industry, then an industrial section is formed which will elect national officials, and will be allowed to work out a policy for dealing with its own particular industry so long as it does not run counter to the principles of the general organisation. The local committees are then grouped together in districts, divisions, and nationally.

One of the most important means whereby the propaganda of such an organisation can be carried on (in addition to workshop propaganda) is propaganda through the union branches. The propaganda work of the local committee will be tested not by the number of street corner meetings which they are able to hold, but in the number of local branches of unions that they are able to persuade to listen to their speakers. Local conferences of Trade Union branches can also be called where the delegates will have the position of the committees placed before them so that they can report back to their branches. By those means interest can be stimulated and the organisation built up.

The putting forward of a constructive policy throughout the branches and workshops of any industry is facilitated by the national organisation of the Workers Committees. Hitherto the rebel elements in many industries have worked in isolation from each other, often without a concerted policy. The Workers Committee movement is desirous of bringing all the fighting elements together, industry by industry, union by union, in order that their strength shall be concentrated and a united effort put forward for revolutionising Trade Unionism.

## To a Miner.

We hae them here ca'd lords and sirs, wha neither toil nor spin,
Propped up by servile flatterers, wha hope some grace tae win;
And tho' we lose ae parasite, anither ane succeeds him,
Sae independent he can bite the very hand that feeds him.

Jist watch them doon in London toon, dressed up in gold and ermine,
Like bees a-swarming roond the Croon when Parliament's assemblin',
Parading thro' the thoroughfares, in cushioned cars reclining,
Nae mair a thocht o' State affairs than I hae o' resigning.

Their braw bay mares like statues stand, held fast by tinselled flunkeys,
A' they require's a German band, some elephants and monkeys;
The ladies blushing red wi' pride, or is it wi' excitement,
Or can it be the he'rt inside that's seeking mair enlightment.

But oh, the men look wondrous wise on ony State occasion,
And tell you frankly when they rise they live to serve the nation;
And, man, they look that richt sincere, nae sign but what seems honest,
That even working bodies cheer and throw awa' their bonnets.

In public eye they "chew the fat," and snarl at ane anither,
Ca' this ane this and that ane that, use every name but brither;
But watch them when there's danger near, and their false right's disputed,
Hoo staunch thigither they adhere until the foe is routed.

They sip the choicest foreign wine, we quench oor thirst wi' water,
The mair that you and I decline, they day by day grow fatter;
They breathe the purest of God's air and idly sport their time,
Yet you lie cramped and gasping there in suffocating mine.

They waste far more than e'er you use, yet tell you you are thriftless,
They censure you with vile abuse, to labour more and think less;
They house their horses in a place that you would think a palace,
And yet they teach each coming race to bear the rich no malice.

Yet you and I slave day by day in this vile hell on earth,
Denied the joys of the sun's bright ray, and the wild bird's song of mirth;
This is the class that staked the claim, that should be ours by right,
And here we stand, half blind and lame, divided in the fight.

Fife. JOE CORRIE.

# The Firing Line in America.

## An Appreciation of Jack Carney.

### By R. M. FOX.

The capitalists of all countries do not let the workers forget that their movement is an international one. The governments unite in suppressing revolutionary ideas everywhere. In England the standard sentence is about six months; in America it varies from about 5 to 20 years. To some people this is a sign that the British Government is very merciful; it seems almost generous to give a man only six months for expressing his opinions! Yet it would appear that under the same British Government people are shot in Ireland with or without "trial." It is evident that utility rather than ethics is the guiding principle of each government in dealing with discontented workers.

Jack Carney, who many of the "Worker" readers, especially in the London area, will know either personally or by repute, is at present in the American firing line. A brief record of his case will indicate what the workers are faced with there.

A line or two sketching the background will not be amiss. Carney's work as an agitator in England began with the Dublin strike. Prior to this he was a shipping clerk in Belfast. Events in Ireland resulted in his being bound over "to keep the peace" in bonds of £200. Believing that the peace should not be kept, he came to England and proceeded to break it. He had boundless faith in the Labour movement and some knowledge of it; since then his knowledge has increased while his faith has not diminished. In those days he "soap-boxed" it through England, as Connolly had done through the States with his evangel of revolt.

He became familiar with what De Quincey has called "the stony-hearted stepmother of the London streets." Throughout long nights he waited for the dawn by the massed shadows of the Thames embankment. The embankment is a kindergarten for humanity. Many who drift there gaze at the row of bead-like lights which shine through the mists over the water; they con things over and arrive at conclusions the reverse of orthodox. One does not suffer from fatty degeneration of the intellect there. One does not accumulate cant. Jack Carney passed through this school.

The war broke out and the anti-war struggle commenced. A great "Anti-Conscription Demonstration" was announced, and the London "Daily Express" beat up the patriotic bullies to smash it. They did smash the platform, though the meeting continued on the ground. Carney was in the vanguard of that. In the afternoon he spoke in the same place.

Comrades of the Clyde Workers' Committee will remember the "red spot" of London to which they sent delegates during the deportees' strike. The "Express" obligingly billed it "Seditionists in London." Carney helped to keep that red flame burning during the dark days.

Now let us turn to America. In 1917 Carney began to edit "The Truth" at Duluth, Minnesota. Its motto was, "Workers of the world unite! Less philosophising and more action." Naturally the authorities could not let it alone—besides, look at its name! Could that be tolerated! In 1919 Jack Carney was arrested for urging American soldiers not to go to Russia, also for urging workers not to make munitions for Polish and Russian bandits. He was tried before Judge Morris in Duluth, Minnesota. "Truth" versus "Justice"—what a dilemma for the moralists! Carney conducted his own defence. He stated that he was in favour of what he had published, and that he stood unreservedly with Lenin and the Soviet Republic. He did not temporise. There is the ring of truth in his statement.

The jury found him guilty, and sentenced him to two years hard labour. There is the ring of "Justice" in that! The case is now in the Appeal Court.

In the meantime Carney began to edit the "Butte Daily Bulletin." Butte, Montana, is a town with a history. The mine-workers there discovered some years ago that all their union officials were being paid by the mineowners. They had to start a new union. Things are done rather crudely there. Butte was the place from which Frank Little of the I.W.W. was taken out and lynched. A New York correspondent recently wrote an account of the newspaper offices and plant. He made a story out of the fact that an old church was used for the editorial office. He told his readers how the sayings of Jesus had been washed off the walls, and how Karl Marx reigned supreme. He explained how the "New Freedom" by Woodrow Wilson had been discarded, and instead the editorial staff placed its faith in a dozen Winchester rifles. When an election takes place there is a man placed at each window of the office with a rifle. Every member of the staff, with the exception of Carney (because he is an alien) is given a permit by the district judge, which allows him to carry an automatic loaded with bullets. The "Bulletin" is, it may be guessed, a bright paper. It is impossible to be dull under the circumstances. There are no ten commandments in Butte, Montana. It keeps closely in touch with the English movement. Articles from the "Worker" are frequently reprinted, among others that series dealing with Russia was reproduced in the "Bulletin."

Jack Carney was arrested six times, and his bonds amount to 15,500 dollars. Evidently the value of revolutionaries is rising. In his case it rose from £200 in Ireland to 15,000 in the States.

He was also sentenced to from one to five years for being a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Labour Party. This case is also in the Appeal Court at present. During all the time pending these appeals Carney has gone on writing, speaking, and working for the cause. It he has to do the seven years he will go down without flinching. Such is the calibre of the men of our movement. Our dear friends, the profiteers, cannot understand this attitude. Neither in their balance sheets on week-days nor in their pews on Sundays do they find a satisfactory explanation. How should they? What measure have they in their mean souls which they can apply? They can only repay our contempt with hatred and a growing fear. They dimly realise that the ground on which they tread is no longer safe. Around and underneath them there are social tremors. Here and there in different parts of the world the lightning flashes out, and they are getting mortally afraid of that movement which may blaze up and clean the earth. Hence their growing ferocity everywhere.

I do not write this account of Jack Carney's case in any spirit of hero worship. The whole philosophy of the workers' movement is against the "great man theory." A man is worth nothing except in so far as he is the voice of something greater than himself. Yet the movement should see that this case gets the publicity which it deserves. And it is well to remember when we are hard pressed in this country that we have soldiers of the line carrying on the same struggle against the same enemy elsewhere. The cry of the class war prisoners in the past rings out as defiantly as ever—"Some day our silence will be more powerful than the voices you are strangling to-day."

# The W.I.I.U. and the International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions.

By H. M. ROGERS.

The report of the W.I.I.U. to the July 1st congress of the International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions, which appeared in their weekly official organ, "The Industrial News" of April 30, offers the most palpable exhibition of opportunism and complete abandonment of revolutionary principles.

That the W.I.I.U. should echo the discarded principles of the obsolete Second International and reincarnate Kautskyism in their report is startling.

Yet these opportunists have the temerity to demand recognition of their organisation by asserting "that upon giving careful consideration to our principles and tactics we feel that the congress will be convinced that the W.I.I.U. is entitled to admission and recognition by the congress as the clearest and best expression of revolutionary Socialist Industrial Unionism of the North American Continent."

The preamble of their organisation is quoted in full, and De Leon's comments on the preamble are also quoted at length in order to prove to the congress the infallibility of their organisation and its tactics.

After extolling the wisdom of De Leon as "one of the greatest expounders of Socialism since Marx," the report again reiterates, "the W.I.I.U. of the United States maintains that its tactics are peculiarly adopted to the advanced capitalist conditions prevailing on the North American Continent."

The report becomes very emphatic, and vehemently attacks the "Anarcha-Syndicalist, I.W.W." Nearly one-third of the report is taken up in citing the alleged commissions of sins and crimes of the I.W.W.

Petty incidents of no significance, things which are long forgotten and passed into oblivion, are recalled. Documentary proof is presented in order to prove that the I.W.W. is counter-revolutionary; that the I.W.W. approved of the operation of Kolchak, Denikin, and Wrangel against the Soviets.

The O.B.U. and other I.W.W. papers are quoted in order to substantiate these charges against the I.W.W. Though the report admits that John Sandgren, editor of the O.B.U. monthly, "the original prototype of the Anarco-Syndicalist I.W.W. was removed because of the protest of this piece of work—the boycott of the "O.B.U. Monthly" killed that paper and also buried Sandgren in the debris."

The long cherished rancour and derision against everybody who is not of their kind constitutes a part of the W.I.I.U. creed. The report reveals its flunkeyism and opportunism when it deals with the advocacy of the Proletarian Dictatorship.

"The W.I.I.U.," continues the report, "can agree with all the requirements outlined in the Manifesto and Declaration of Principles calling for the organisation of the International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions, except point (G). All the rest of the manifesto reads as the programme of tactics followed for the last 15 years by the W.I.I.U."

Point (G) however deals with the advocacy of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and the hackneyed liberals of the W.I.I.U. can't digest it.

Read the shallow and clumsy arguments advanced by the renegade leaders of the W.I.I.U. I will quote these Kautskyian sophistries in length.

"We can apply no better argument against this section (G) than to produce the following lines of the Declaration of Principles of the W.I.I.U. They cover the tactical requirements in America for our movement."

The first paragraph of the preamble is quoted. And the report continues: "This language is plain and to the point. It is in conformity with American institutions, history and traditions. It is the outgrowth of our experience in the American Labour movement. To adopt the Dictatorship formula would mean that we abandon our present declaration of principles. This means that we outlaw ourselves, and would have to crawl into the conspiracy rat-holes which the Communists now occupy."

These utterances by an organisation professing to be revolutionary must be very agreeable to the ear of the bourgeoisie.

No wonder the renegade leaders of the W.I.I.U. were immune from ferocious attacks and persecution by Palmer and his agents while thousands of Communists and I.W.W. have been and are ruthlessly persecuted and incarcerated in prisons.

Such a flunkeyism surpasses Gomperism; and the Bergers, Steadmans, and Hillquits are pikers compared to the social patriots and respectable law-abiding citizens of the W.I.I.U.

"It is the essence of democracy," goes on the report, "that the minority bow to and submit to the decisions of the majority. Such discipline cannot be called a 'dictatorship.' Abraham Lincoln spoke for the people in no uncertain terms, and was upheld in his suppression of the pro-slavery rebels. When Woodrow Wilson was elected in 1912 the discipline of democracy demanded that the defeated Republicans, Progressives, and other groups respected the verdict of the election. And they did—to advocate a dictatorship in the United States would be incompatible with, ridiculous and flying in the face of all the facts pertaining to the situation in America."

The Declaration of Independence is quoted to substantiate these shallow arguments. However, I shall not fatigue the reader in quoting these sophistries advanced by these renegades. If the ruling class would only know what staunch and stalwart supporters of the capitalist laws the W.I.I.U. are, they would exalt their leaders to the highest ranks, would bestow upon them all good things, would give them millions to carry on such a propaganda.

"The question of the Proletarian Dictatorship," says Lenin, "is the question of the relation between the proletarian state and the bourgeois state, between proletarian democracy and bourgeois democracy," and goes on dialectically to show "that the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is an authority maintained by the proletariat by means of force over and against the bourgeoisie and not bound by laws." But the opportunist W.I.I.U. rehearses the Kautskyism interpretation of the state and bourgeois democracy.

I am constrained to quote again the report which so admirably interprets the bourgeoisie arguments against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

"To appeal for a dictatorship of the proletariat before we have tried the peaceful method of the ballot box is out of the question in America."

Like blind puppies these opportunists cannot see the simple truth, though it is plain as noonday. War and revolution should have ere now proven this error to everyone, but these refined flunkies would crawl on their bellies to the ballot box for two thousand years in pursuit of a "peaceful method."

Comrade Lenin in his illuminating book "The Proletarian Revolution" points out very explicitly:

"The more developed democracy is, the nearer at hand is the danger of a pogrom or civil war in connection with any profound political divergence which threatens the existence of the bourgeoisie." To manifest such sheer ignorance and monstrous stupidity, not to comprehend such simple truths that bourgeoisie parliaments are directly controlled by the stock exchange and bankers is unpardonable.

Another absurdity is presented in justifying their opposition to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat by asserting that "America is one of the countries where a peaceful solution of the social question is possible."

L. Kameneff defines the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as "an organisation of the State and a form of administration of State affairs which in the transitional stage from Capitalism to Communism will allow the proletarian, as the ruling class, to crush all resistance on the part of the exploiters to the work of Socialist reconstruction."

Continues Comrade Kanemeff: "It is thus clear that the question itself of the necessity, the inevitability of a proletarian dictatorship for every capitalist country is connected with the question as to whether the resistance of the exploiters to their expropriation by Socialist society—or more precisely by society marching towards Socialism."

"In the same way the question regarding the degree of severity of the dictatorship, the extent and conditions of the limitations of the political rights of the bourgeoisie, and limitation of political liberty in general, the application of terrorist methods, etc., is indissolubly linked with the question of the degree, forms, stubbornness, and organisation of resistance by the exploiters."

The possibility of a peaceful solution through the method of the ballot box; the organisation of all the workers under the banner of the W.I.I.U. and other like utopians are advanced as arguments against the dictatorship of the proletariat, constitutes the gist of the report.

The report ends with the assertion:—

"We are small in numbers, perhaps the smallest, compared with other unions, but we are certain we have the tactics and the principles necessary for success in the United States."

"These we will not compromise."

Thus the utter perversion of revolutionary principles, thus the opportunistic trend of an element claiming to be revolutionary, but which, unless it perceives its errors, may join the blackest forces of reaction to uphold the laws of the bourgeois State to keep the toilers in slavery and degradation.


JUST PUBLISHED!

CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHIC REPORT

of the

GREATEST DEBATE IN A DECADE

PROF. SCOTT NEARING

(Rand School of Social Science, Author of "The American Empire," and foremost exponent of Socialism in America)

versus

PROF E. R. A. SELIGMAN

(Head of the Department of Economics, Columbia University, Author of numerous text-books on economics used by most of the American Capitalist Universities, and foremost exponent and defender of American Capitalism).

Introduction by OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD,

Editor of "The Nation" and foremost

Liberal in America.

Subject—Resolved: That Capitalism has more to offer to the workers of the United States than has Socialism.

Held in New York City, January 23, 1921, before an audience of 4,500.

Paper Cover, 4/-; Cloth, 8/-, post paid.

Illustrated by photographs of Debaters.

THE FINE ARTS GUILD Inc., 489 Fifth Av., New York City, U.S.A.


FREE YOUTH LECTURES.

Commence first Sunday in October at 6.30 in Bijou Picture Palace, Cowcaddens. Lantern Lecture, "Red Rubber," by Tom Anderson.

Free Youth College opens first Sunday October, 12 noon, St. Mungo Halls. Text book, "A Worker Looks at History." Tom Anderson, teacher.

ATTENTION! ATTENTION! ATTENTION!

GLASGOW AND DISTRICT MAY-DAY COMMITTEE.

The usual Meeting of Delegates will be held on Saturday, 25th June, 1921, at 3 p.m., in the Tinplate Workers' Hall, 9 Watson Street (near Glasgow Cross). All Delegates are requested to attend as there is business of vital importance. Those Societies which have not yet paid affiliation fee might send on at once to the Secretary, JOHN M'DOUGALL, 239 Crookston Street, Glasgow, S.S.

# What the Scabs Won't Do.

No scab would write back home and say:
"Dear mother, I am scabbing;
I'm working here in a vile bull pen
At the only job worth grabbing.
I work, eat, sleep here on the job;
Am penned in like a crook,
And have armed guards protecting me
From the men whose job I took."

Nor would he write to Molly Dun
And say: "My Molly, dear,
I want to prove myself a man,
And that is why I'm here.
I'm praying for the day to come
When you and I shall wed;
I know, dear, you agree with me,
'Tis best to scab for bread."

Nor would he take his little kids
And place them on his knee,
And tell with pride of the time he scabbed
On men who would be free.
But the man who fights for his Union cause
May tell with keenest pride
His dear old mother, way back home,
Or the girl he would make his bride.
Exactly what his pursuit is;
He has no cause for shame;
And the kiddies, too, are glad to hear
Of the days when dad was game.

—Selected, from "Electrical Trades Journal."

### The Army.

In the army estimates of effective and non-effective service for the year 1921-22 just issued the financial statement estimates cash payments chargeable to army funds at £118,915,000 less receipts (appropriations in aid) of £12,600,000, or a total required amount of £106,315,000 for the upkeep of the army. This is after a war to crush militarism, in which the British Empire had a total casualty list of 3,000,000.

### For Russia.

The "Germania" reports that Soviet Russia has ordered over 600 railway locomotives from German firms. The price is not definitely known, but the Soviet economic journal recently stated that German firms asked two million marks per locomotive, i.e., £17,000, while English firms put in tenders for £20,000 to £24,000 sterling, and American for 65,000 to 77,000 dollars, i.e., £16,250 to £19,500 approximately.

Some seventy periodicals printed in Esperanto—the universal language—are now published.


TENTS.—Join the Red Army of Campers by investing in the dainty "Wanderlust," Scotland's best touring tent. Goes into rucksac or cycle carrier. Order early. Send for booklet, "Camping for All," per post 5d., and new price list.—MACLEOD, Plea-Knowne, by Chryston.


Why mope in the crowded town when the open road calls?

COMMUNIST PARTY (GRENNOCK BRANCH)

M'CUE PRIZE DRAW FUND.

1st—P. Canning 3 Argyll Street, Port-Glasgow.
2nd—George Hooper, 10 Inchgreen St., Greenock.
3rd—A. Gregory, 9 South Street, Greenock.
4th—Comrade Proctor, Port-Glasgow.
5th—Mr M'Alees, "Flying Sprite."


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