

Breakers Ahead in the Marine Workers' Union.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by
SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. IX. No. 10.

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1922.

[WEEKLY.]

PRICE TWOPENCE.

MORE TRADE.

(After Rudyard Kipling.)

Take up the sword and rifle;
Send forth your ships with speed,
To join the nations' scramble,
And vie with them in greed.
Go find your goods a market
Beyond the Western flood;
The poor folk who withstand you
Shall answer it in blood.

Take up the sword and rifle,
For so does all the world:
There's none shall dare upbraid you,
When once your flag's unfurled.
The race is to the swiftest,
The battle to the strong;
Success is the criterion,
None cares to count the wrong.

Take up the sword and rifle,
And know no fear or pause.
What though your hands be bloody,
Who calls ye to the laws?
The ports ye wish to enter,
The roads ye wish to tread,
Make them with workers living,
Make them with workers dead.

Take up the sword and rifle,
Rob every savage race:
Amuse their lands and harbours,
For this is Christian grace.
F'en though ye slaughter thousands,
Ye still may count it gain;
If ye extend your commerce,
Why dread the curse of Cain?

Take up the sword and rifle,
Still keep your conscience whole—
So soon is found an unction
To soothe a guilty soul—
Go with it to your Maker:
Deceive Him if ye can.
Rob for the sake of justice:
Kill for the love of man.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

TO OUR READERS.

We wish to draw the special attention of Comrades to Rosa Luxemburg's world-famous book on the Russian Revolution, which we are serialising in our columns; also to the important series by Alexandra Kollontay, which we are also publishing. We urge you to secure the widest possible publicity for these articles.

That brings us to an important point. Week by week the *Workers' Dreadnought* contains material which does not appear in any other organ in this country, and which is essential to an intelligent understanding of the Communist movement to-day. We desire this valuable information to reach as large a circle as possible.

We urge those who are already readers of the paper to bring it to the notice of others.

We ask you:—

To get your friends to buy and read the *Dreadnought*.

To sell it, or see that it is on sale at all meetings held in your district.

To get your newsagent to stock it and show a poster.

We are prepared to send the *Dreadnought* free for four weeks to anyone whose name and address you send to us as likely to be interested in the paper.

GERMANY, 1914-1918.



WHO
WILL BE OUR ALLIES NEXT TIME.

FINN AND IAP.

It almost seems that the world is ripe for happiness, were it not for Governments!

We reproduce here the last two stanzas of a little poem in Esperanto, that appeared in the Japanese periodical "La Verda Utopio," it was written by Dr. Darmstedt, a Finnish professor, on his return from a visit to Japan.

Ankaŭ vi, la sinjorino,
Kiu min en Esperanto
Benvenigis, vi meritis,
Ke mi vin en mia kanto
Laŭte laŭdas kaj aplaudas,
Car vi bone ja parolas.
Certe vi meritas kanton,
Min akceptu, se vi volas.

Estas stulte skribi multe,
Se la propraj vortoj mankas.
Sed vi sciis ĉiuj, ĉio.
Ke mi dankas, kore dankas.
Oran dankon, Osakanoj!
Jam finiĝas finna kanto
Kaj anstataŭ adiaŭ
Estu: Banzai Esperanto.

Which means in English, briefly:—

And you, Lady, who in Esperanto
Greeted me, deserve that in my Canto
I praise you, for indeed you speak it well.

Whilst I can only say in words too few
To my Osaka friends for my farewell,
Banzai, Esperanto! A heart's adieu!

What better proof have we of the fact that Esperanto acts as a world freemasonry; the Doctor, who had learnt some Esperanto, evidently sought out the Esperantists in Osaka and was so well received that he wrote these verses to his entertainers, who, in their turn, had them published.

If Dr. Darmstedt had not learnt Esperanto he would have had to learn Japanese (he probably knew Japanese, but that is exceptional) or the Japanese would have had to learn Finnish, both much more difficult and less useful languages, or else found an interpreter who happened to know both Finnish and Japanese! A somewhat improbable combination; so Esperanto is a factor that helps to ripen the world for happiness!

PARLIAMENT THE PEOPLE'S ENEMY.

Now that so many of the workers have learnt that they are an oppressed and robbed class, learnt through bitter experience, it seems cruel that parties should arise which are trying to revive their faith in Parliament.

To-day we have more homeless and badly-housed, ill-clad, semi-starved, sick people in the British Isles than ever before, and yet we have more Labour Members in Parliament.

These facts, which greet us at every step, should convince us that Parliament does not protect or save the common people.

Putting aside the fact that Parliament is not democratically chosen by the people, but that candidates and election funds are in the hands of certain cliques in which the workers have little power or choice, the machinery of Parliament is devised to suit the interests of these same people—not the workers.

Parliament is used to keep the rich rich, and the poor poor, and the Labour Party is impotent to alter this.

It can alleviate or apply palliatives during industrial crises when Capital over-reaches itself; in other words, it staves off the explosion of the gasometer.

On Wednesday, May 5th, 1921, the important subject of the London rates was discussed. Eight Labour Members turned up.

On Wednesday, May 6th, when Col. Wedgwood Benn tried to move that the House should adjourn in order to discuss the Polish War, only 36 Labour Members supported him—36 out of 66; so you can send your Member to Parliament, but you cannot be sure he will attend to your business.

Questioned on the Polish War, the Speaker replied: "That cannot be said to be a matter of urgent public importance." Has, then, the taking of human life and the diverting of labour from useful production to the making or sending of munitions become such a small matter, at a time when bread and other necessities are badly wanted in order to defend our country from within?

It was not so when the capitalists wanted to discuss war in order to wage it, but stopping it is another matter.

When the *Daily Herald* grumbled at the Labour Members for not being in their places, the Secretary wrote to say: "The Party was taken unawares."

That condemns the Parliamentary machine more than ever, for it shows Capital can easily get its own way by "taking them unawares," resorting to tricks, subterfuges, and other underhand means which would be impossible under the Soviet system.

Many a well-intentioned Socialist enters Parliament in the vain hope that he can revolutionise it, but Parliament revolutionises him.

He is brave enough to enter Parliament, but seldom has the courage to come out, shake the musty dust off his feet, and build ready against the day when Parliament has played its last dastardly card and fallen by it.

I would write over the door "Abandon hope all ye who enter here," for Parliament is dehumanising.

To people who think it useful, I would point out that the Parliamentary machine is too complicated and overburdened with capitalistic rules, which would prove a stumbling-block to the workers; rules made in order to baffle the workers and to find soft jobs for lawyers and capitalists' sons; rules made in order to awe, impress and silence the uninitiated. Well may the man in the street say: "I don't understand politics."

In the preface to Frank Hodges' "Nationalisation of Mines," J. R. Clynes admits "The freedom of political democracy is a magnificent accomplishment, but it is now realised that the slavery of industry is harsher than the slavery of the unfranchised serf." Proving that industrial freedom is more necessary than political freedom; in fact, true industrial freedom spells political freedom.

When everyone is assured of good industrial conditions there will be no need to petition the political machine.

If we build away from it, it will die.

When we have no rich, no poor, when all our children are well fed, clothed, and housed, our country will be defended.

Parliament is a machine for exploiting the people, not for defending them.

As regards its being wrong to strike for political reasons, so long as politicians interfere with Labour, Labour is right in striking for political reasons, and it is often the only redress for industrial wrongs.

If Labour had struck against the War and continued the industrial fight instead of calling a truce, we should not be in the plight we are.

The Soviet system, even in this early stage, has shown some grand results; but with the blockade lifted, and the cessation of capitalist intervention, life in Russia for the workers would be Heaven in comparison with the worker's life under our system.

It is useless even to ask a question in Parliament, for Ministers constantly reply: "It is not in the public interest," or they give a half-lie which is more misleading than a whole one.

Why do we need to ask so many questions which ought to be common knowledge? When these people ask to be allowed to represent us in Parliament and they know the business and we do not, how can they be said to represent our side of the question?

If capitalists in Parliament cannot work their will by fair constitutional means, they never hesitate to do it by foul unconstitutional means, such as Lloyd George used when he refused to give the House an assurance that it would be consulted before any new allied advance was made in Germany, also when he suppressed Krassin's Peace Note in October 1920 he unconstitutionally kept the peace terms from the nation.

Telegrams and letters are suppressed, and Lord Milner even altered one telegram, thus causing the Boer War.

All the tall talk about Parliament being our servant is nonsense. Parliament is our master, and what they do not say or accomplish at Westminster is said and carried out in secret at Lympe or elsewhere.

Two or three men arrange and ratify secret treaties which are to be the means of murdering millions of useful and innocent people, and all the boasted machinery of Parliament is useless to restrain these men or take precautionary measures for frustrating or even knowing their plans. This same Government causes the man in the street to be arrested for the slightest unconstitutional act, at the same time allowing Carsonites to stop by force a constitutional ballot.

In Belfast on May 17th, 1921, the Labour candidates were forcibly prevented from opening their election campaign. Why talk about acting in a constitutional manner and the power of the ballot-box when in America, after five members had been elected constitutionally, the capitalists refused to allow them to take their seats?

Moreover, of what use to waste time in getting a Bill passed and placed on the Statute-book, as the Home Rule Bill for Ireland was passed, if the Bill is not to be carried out?

When the Home Rule Bill was placed on the Statute-book the British Government, by sending troops over to suppress the Irish people, was fighting against what it had itself made lawful by Act of Parliament.

Three or four men were instrumental in dragging England into the greatest war in history without the knowledge of Parliament; indeed, the alliances were denied, and the majority of members deceived.

In fact, now they do not even declare war, probably knowing that if they did, the war-weary nation would object, so they wage it without declaring it or asking permission, as in Ireland and Russia. Labour's hard-earned wealth is squandered to crush peoples who are fighting for Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality.

The Speaker can refuse to give his eye to a Member, and thus scotch or shelve anything.

The Indian question was treated thus, and Col. Wedgwood, the chosen speaker of the Labour Party, was denied a hearing, though his name had been duly and constitutionally handed in beforehand.

We are suffering through Parliamentary administration, and do not want to capture a machine devised by the capitalistic class. How can it be adapted to the aims of Socialism?

The following condemns Parliamentarians out of their own mouths:—

Mr. T. A. Blane (Coalition Member), speak-

ing at Leicester, said: "Members of Parliament are a strong body of men sent to Westminster to carry out the wishes of the majority; but they are disappointed to find this country is ruled by a mere handful of men who are simply the mouth-pieces of bureaucracy."

"He recognised how futile was the effort of the individual Member of the House of Commons. When he saw how little they could do, either collectively or individually, he wondered how the people tolerated the present system of government."—*Daily Herald*, May 23rd, 1921.

If it is wrong and futile, why not scrap it? They do not hesitate to do so where a battleship is concerned; but the more important ship of State, however obsolete, is to be retained.

We allow Parliament to scrap much better things, the Plimsoll line, for instance, a reform that a man fought twenty years to obtain, was scrapped in order to make money, and seamen's lives counted of less value than a heavy cargo.

When Commander Kenworthy asked leave to move the adjournment of the House on the allied advance into Germany, only thirty-six Members rose to support him on April 28th, 1921.

A telegraphist or ordinary paid servant of the community is forced to show a doctor's certificate if he does not turn up at his post. The Members of Parliament are the well-paid servants of the community; why are they not made to do the same?

Pacifists who will not enter the revolutionary movement, deeming it militant, deceive themselves when they enter Parliament if they think they are still pacifists and the man who belongs to a party that has a red army is not, because Parliament is upheld by, and rests upon, force.

The Lord Chancellor (and he ought to know) said: "Mr. Collins was apprehensive that an attempt . . . might be made to destroy the provisional Government by seducing the armed forces, upon whom, if it came to a trial of strength, it must in the last resort depend."—*Daily Herald*, February 15th, 1922.

After result of election, Richard Davies said: "I have lost because my opponents took special care to circulate the idea that the Labour Party is a party of disruption, out for a violent revolution with the object of destroying capital and reducing society to a state of chaos!"

The *Daily Herald* adds: "Lord Percy's wealthy supporters lent him an enormous fleet of cars. Davies was placed at a distinct disadvantage owing to the weather and lack of cars."

Is Richard Davies out for the destruction of capitalism? If not, he is useless either inside the House or outside; for so long as we have capitalists, so long shall we have poor people on the precipice of starvation.

Of what value the vote of a man if he will only register it for a ride in a motor-car?

If the vote depends on the possession of cars, the rich man can always win; for the workers only make them, they do not possess them.

Now turn to the Privy Council, "the private Council of the English Sovereign, the members of which are chosen at his or her pleasure." This Council does not represent the people.

A Labour leader takes the Privy Councillor's oath of allegiance, in which he swears over and over again to defend the King, but he never swears to defend the people.

In times of crisis history has again and again shown that the parties, Conservatives, Liberals, and Labour, quickly join hands (coalesce) against the interests of the people. At the declaration of the late War the Labour Party dropped the workers' war in order to back up a capitalist war; and if Parliament wants to do an unconstitutional thing it makes it constitutional by rushing a Bill through in a few hours, as in the case of the "Emergency Powers Bill," and the people have no voice or choice in the matter.

Parliamentarian Socialists say they are going to get Communism through Parliament.

If a Bill had to go through the House of Lords which would destroy the Lords' position, how could you expect it to pass? These men have long stuck to one-third of the land. Do you think their evil record should lead us to hope that they will themselves help us to get back the land? As soon expect the proverbial camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

The reason Parliamentarians will never bring Communism is that they can only think and act in Parliamentary palliative grooves, for their idea

is to sit aloof and aloft on a glorified platform, graciously giving the people Socialism, whereas the people ought to carry it out for themselves.

During the coal strike, Members of a future Labour Cabinet altered or refused to carry out the decisions that had been voted upon. If these men let a strike down, be sure they will let the revolution down.

If the present capitalist basis of society is to be razed to the ground, Parliament must go first as it is built upon the foundations of capitalism—namely, money.

Do not waste your time trying to smash it from within, or you will fall with it. When organisation in the workshop is complete, Parliament will die; industry can live without politics, but politics cannot live without industry.

Can you imagine after the foregoing unconstitutional record that capitalists will be turned out of Parliament by constitutional means?

No; to enter Parliament with the capitalist system still going is only to perpetuate that system.

Under the present system no number of Labour men in Parliament can achieve Communism, for if they get more money than the industrial worker they go in as members of a ruling or superior class.

Communists inside Parliament are out to improve the capitalist system.

Even Earl Stanhope admits economics and politics are one and the same thing. He says: "Why, oh why, can British diplomacy not realise that it exists for trade, and because of trade, and that its reason for existing is primarily to ensure the peaceful and uninterrupted flow of our commerce and all the fruits of our industry throughout the markets of the world."

Note: "Our industry," from a man who is only industrious in spending the profits.

How seriously these men take the affairs of starving people the following will show: "The Home Secretary himself lounged on the Treasury Bench with his feet on the table.—*Daily Herald*, May 15th, 1921.

The following is a quotation from a speech by C. B. Stanton, M.P.:

"Besides," he added, "is the Government aware that if the answer is in one direction I have lost a bet with a friend?"—*Daily Herald*, May 6th, 1921.

On August 5th, 1921, the *Daily Herald*, which advocates voting, said: "By appointing an Advisory Committee of big business, under the chairmanship of Geddes, the Government is now openly and publicly proclaiming its own incompetence, abdicating from its duties, and handing over the destinies of the people to a clique of oligarchs not elected (italics mine) not wanted, not to be trusted." Of what use your Member or your vote?

The *Daily Herald* says of the new Bill to reform the House of Lords (the House that owns one-third of our land): "It will remove the last vestige of popular control and enable the Second Chamber to thwart every proposal of a Labour Government."

Col. Malone says: "I entered Parliament in the hope of assisting to better the social conditions. I have seen from the inside the futility of Parliamentary action so far as fundamentals are concerned," and "If you are out to destroy the system, you cannot begin with taking the oath of allegiance to the symbol of that very system."

In conclusion, "present want knows no futurity"; of what immediate value is the vote to a starving man? William Morris says: "To return to our Government of the future, which would be rather an administration of things than a government of persons."

Control your own workshops, your own food stores. In short, control all that makes life worth while. Only allow commodities to be distributed, but never allow profit to be made out of them. Make for use, not for profit. Work the land that is held up by those who never till it, or allow others to do so who, while they never work, yet have recreation grounds that stretch from sea to sea. Plough the untilled land from John o' Groats to Lands End. Share the fruits, each for all and all for each.

One great objection to Parliament is that men with £400 to £5,000 a year are not capable of

legislating for the great majority of workers. No man has a right to preach economy to another until he has reduced his income to the same level as the man to whom he is dictating.

Kings, dukes, and rich men cannot represent slum dwellers.

The *Daily Herald* said on July 15th, 1921: "Parliament is adjourning from August to February," for six months. Business went on just as usual, but when the miners struck, or were locked out, industry was paralysed."

The actual stonework is crumbling, workmen daily try to patch it up; this symbolises that the spirit which animated it is dying.

Come into the sunlight and build away from this unconstitutional constitution.

CLARA GILBERT COLE.

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.

By TOM ANDERSON.

"A Child's Lesson" (Samson—Judges, 13-16).

Samson was the strong man of the Hebrews. He lived about 2,000 years before the Christian era. He was a holy child born of the Lord; that is why he was a strong man. His mother was barren, and an angel of the Lord visited her and told her she would have a child.

Samson's mother was just a little dubious of the angel's story, so she went and told her husband what the man of God had said to her. He listened to what his wife told him, then he said: "The next time this man visits you, come and let me know."

True to his promise, the angel of the Lord visited her again, one day while she was in the field, and she said unto the man of God:

"Please tarry awhile, that I may go and inform my husband."

So she went and told him that the man of God was here, and so her husband went and had a conversation with the man of God, and the man of God said to Manoah:

"Your wife shall have a son, and the Lord shall be the father, and you shall call his name Samson."

Manoah and his wife then offered up a sacrifice to God for His great kindness unto them, and lo and behold the angel of the Lord ascended up into heaven in the flame of the sacrifice; then Manoah knew he had seen God.

Manoah's wife had a child, and she called his name Samson as she had been commanded by the angel of the Lord to do.

Samson, when he grew up, was very fond of the ladies, and so he made his father and mother go down to Timnath and get him a daughter of the Philistines.

They did not want to go, but Samson said: "Go and get her for me." And so they went. And on the way down Samson kills a young lion with his hands, just as easily as you would kill a mouse.

Samson also did some wonderful feats. He went and caught 300 foxes, and tied them tail to tail with burning torches on their tails, so they ran into the fields and burnt up all the corn of the Philistines. This is more than great modern Christians can do.

He also slew 1,000 Philistines with the jawbone of an ass. That was a good big job. Killing one every minute, it would take him 16½ hours. He also went down to Gaza and stayed with a strange lady, and in the morning he carried away the gates of the city on his shoulders a distance of 40 miles, just to let the Philistines see what he could do.

Samson's great strength lay in his long hair, which had never been cut. And after coddling his wife with false stories he told her his secret, that his strength lay in his hair. So his wife had him bound, and the Philistines cut off his hair.

Poor Samson was done, for they made him a prisoner and put out his eyes.

One day they were having great celebrations, and Samson asked that he might be led to the pillars that support the building, so that he might lean against them. So they led Samson to the pillars, and he put his arms around them and pulled them down; and he killed more people on that day than he had done in all his days.

That is a great story, and the origin of the story of Samson lies in the sun; but it is so long ago that we have forgotten all about it, and the

men who wrote the story as given in the Book of Judges in the Bible were as ignorant of the origin of the story as the Christian gentlemen of our day are.

Every tribe of the world had their Samson, because everyone worshipped the sun. In the course of years it will become a fairy-tale for our children, just like Little Red Riding Hood, which is a part of the same story. So I want you to remember the fairy-tale of Samson, and to laugh when the man with the reversed collar passes you.

ESPERANTO. LA DUPIEDULO.

DAURIGO.

Mi iras alporti kelkajn orangojn, diris la dupiedulo. Eble daŭros malmulte pli longe, ĝis mi revenos, ĉar la arbojn en la proksimeco ni jam ĉiujn senfruktigis.

Ne restu tro longe, diris lia virino, vi scias, ke mi re restas volonte sole en tiu ĉi tempo.

Li travadis la rivereton kaj malaperis en la arbaro. Post unu horo li revenis kaj trovis nur kelke da mizeraj, malgrandaj fruktoj.

Li estis ĉagrena pro tio kaj lia virino simile, ĉar ŝi estis malsata. Ili sidigis kaj konsiligis, ĉu ili ne povus trovi en la proksimeco ian alian manĝeblajn. Ĉar tuj kiam vesperigis, ili ne riskis forlasi la insulon. Hodiaŭ vespere mi vidis la lutron en la akvo, diris lia dupiedulo. Ĝi kaptis grandan fiŝon kaj manĝegis ĝin. Eble ankaŭ mi povus aĝi tiel.

Provu, ŝi diris, ni devas havi nutraĵon, tio estas certa.

Li denove malsupreniris sur la bordon kaj kaptis per la mano grandan ezokon kiu naĝis tute proksimege al li kaj suspektis nenian danĝeron. Ĝi ja tiel ofte vidis lin vadi tra la rivero, ke ĝi ne estis pensinta pri io. Nun li ĵetis ĝin sur la insulon kaj tie kuŝis la mizera ezoko, malfermis sian buŝon kaj spiregis, ĝemadis tiel laŭte, kiel ĝi povis; He, halo! Mortigo! Al la helpo!

Sed jam ĝi estis morta kaj la dupiedulo kaj lia virino manĝis ĝin kun plej bona apetito.

Portu al mi morgaŭ denove fiŝon, ŝi diris. Sincere dirante, mi ekmalsatis jam la pomojn.

La proksiman matenon li denove iris al la rivero. Ne daŭris longe, li trovis bonegan fiŝon, sed ĵus kiam li volis kapti ĝin, alvenis la lutro kaj forkaptis la fiŝon antaŭ lia nazo.

Cu vi ne volas foriri de tie ĉi, impertinenta rabisto! Li kriis kaj batis post ĝi.

Vi diras rabisto? demandis la lutro kaj furioze montris siajn blankajn dentojn. Ĝis nun la rivero apartenis al mi. Mi loĝis tie ĉi, pli antaŭe ol vi venis. La dupiedulo saltis al la tero, alportis grandajn ŝtonojn kaj ĵetis ilin post la lutro. Unu ol ili trafis ĝin sur la buŝo tiel, ke la sango tormente komencis elflui. Tiam ĝi rapidege rifugiĝis, dum la dupiedulo kaptis alian fiŝon kaj alportis ĝin al sia virino.

Sed kiam la lutro vesperigante havis la kuraĝen elfri el sia rifuĝo, la orangutango estis hazarde tie kaj ekbalancis la kapon al ĝi.

Mi vidis ĉion, li diris. Mi sidis sur la arbo kaj vidis. Kiel li ĵetis la ŝtonojn sur vin. La akvo fariĝis ruĝa de via sango. Ankaŭ min li atekis jam foie. Li diris, ke la nomoj apartenas al li kaj fornelis min per batado de la arbo. Kaj tamen ni estas parencoj.

Se mi nur povus lin ataki, diris la lutro, grinante per siaj dentoj; sed mi estas tro malgranda. Alvenos la tempo, alvenos la ago. Konsolis ĝin la orangutango. Ni ankoraŭ venkos lin.

Fino de la dua Ĉapitro.

FOR THE CLASS WAR PRISONERS.

Class war prisoners in U.S.A. may receive books and newspapers sent by the publishers.

Will comrades send contributions towards sending the *Workers' Dreadnought* and our other publications into the American gaols? Will comrades stand out for establishing the same right in this country?

DREADNOUGHT £500 FUND.

Brought forward, £144 12s. 14d. A. Hodson, 6/9; M. Fursell, 12/6; Office Collecting Box, 11d.; D. Jewson, 3/6; A. Proletarian, £10; J. Clarke, 2/3; Minerva Cafe, collection and tea, £1 4s. 3d.; P. Cansick, 2/5; W. Pocock and E. Baker, 5/5; Davie Street, Edinburgh, 10/-; J. Leaky, 6/1; per Sylvia Pankhurst, £1; per Sylvia Pankhurst, 10/- Total for week, £14 3s. 3d. Total, £158 15s. 44d.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOUNDED 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor
Business Communications to the Manager:
Workers' Dreadnought, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.
TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 7240.

SUBSCRIPTION:

THREE MONTHS (13 weeks) ...	Post Free 3/3
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ...	" " 6/6
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ...	" " 13/-

Vol. IX. No. 10. Saturday, May 20, 1922.

GENOA.

So Genoa has collapsed, and the business of opening up Russia to the foreign capitalist—well, we should say the open business, for the secret underhand business goes on all the time—is postponed till June and removed to The Hague.

How much Genoa has achieved in destroying what remained of Socialism in Russia will only come to light gradually.

The editor of *The Times* says that the Russians do not wish America to be represented at The Hague because the Americans will re-enforce the standpoint of the Belgian and French Governments. Of course the Americans will: they are upholding the oil and other deals with Russia in which the British are forestalling the other capitalists.

The *Daily Herald*—innocent *Daily Herald*—reports that Mr. Leslie Urquhart, of the Russo-Asiatic Corporation, has said that the rule of the Soviet Government is the alternative to anarchy in Russia, and must not be upset because "the work begun at Genoa must be continued at all costs."

That work is capitalist work, and British capitalism is the principal gainer thereby. The French capitalists are so jealous that they would fight Britain if they could, and will one day. The prominent rivalries are to-day America-France-Belgium versus Britain, who may take Germany and Russia in tow whenever the British Government thinks that course wise.

GO TO THE GUARDIANS.

A systematic effort is now in progress to cut down relief to the unemployed. They are to go to the Labour Colonies, their wives to the workhouse, the children to the Poor Law schools, whence presently some of the little ones will be sent out to the overseas Dominions.

When the unemployment dole and Poor Law relief are withdrawn, the destitute are unable to pay the rent. They are evicted, by force if necessary. If they take refuge in a shed or camp out they are prosecuted for cruelty to their children; they are sent to prison and the children are taken by the Poor Law authorities.

The *Daily Herald*—O, credulous *Daily Herald*—contains the following passages:—

"All Boards of Guardians should urge the Government, through the Ministry of Health, to enable them to establish labour colonies by Act of Parliament," said Mr. A. H. Bonser (Notts), chairman of the National Vagrancy Committee for England and Wales, speaking at the West-Midland Poor Law Conference at Malvern yesterday.

"By a system of communication with each other, said Mr. Bonser, habitual tramps avoided unions where strict discipline was enforced, and overcrowded those areas where conditions were relaxed.

"It was estimated that there were probably 80,000 of the able-bodied vagrancy class between the ages of twenty and forty-five never intending to do honest work, while the community was content to let them continue carrying on by begging and stealing. This was a real danger, especially in remote country districts."

What does it mean, men and women? It means that when the destitute, shunning the workhouse, dreading the export of their children to the Dominions, migrate into the country to live as best they can the life of the poor wandering tramp, the heavy hand of the Capitalist

Government will follow them thither and send them prisoners to the Labour Colonies.

The fiery cross of revolt must now be raised in the land. We must tear down the system which maintains such iniquities.

BREAKERS AHEAD.

That much-advertised structure, supposed to cater for all seamen, that was going to lead the men of the sea into the promised land (via the channels of "rank and file control," etc.), is at present on the rocks in Liverpool, both in the financial sense and the moral sense.

It is history that for months on end a rank-and-file Vigilance Committee put in strenuous work against Wilson and his henchmen. As soon as the ground was ripe for development along came Cotter and Shinwell, supported by "Order - of - the - Red - Banner Williams, and planted the A.M.W.U. in our midst, thus taking advantage of the sacrifice and work of the Vigilance Committee. Propaganda was distributed wholesale. Every other day would see a different leaflet issued, all pointing out that the N.S. and F.U., with its aristocratic leader Wilson, were retarding the progress of the seamen, and the only "real," "live," "honest," "democratic" organisation with "rank-and-file control" was the A.M.W.U. These statements were naturally tested by those who became members of the new organisation, who, when they moved anything of a progressive nature, were opposed in many instances by some of the local officials who defended the Executive Council, and Joe Cotter in particular, when charges of autocracy were raised.

On April 26th the members were informed that all the local officials had been dismissed by order of the Finance Committee, and the branch offices closed. The members asked questions, and the explanation given by the local officials was that, in the first place, the assistant secretary had been dismissed on some frivolous complaint that did not justify the action taken. His brother officials were not satisfied, and definitely agreed to stand by him until the Finance Committee rescinded its decision. The solidarity of the local officials evidently raised the ire of the powers that be at the Head Office, with the result already stated, that all local officials were dismissed and branch offices closed.

The lay members were not so much concerned over the dismissal of the officials as over the closing of the branch, because the latter move would deliberately play into the hands of Have-lock Wilson, and thus destroy the work accomplished by the Vigilance Committee. A resolution was carried unanimously:—

"That all offices be re-opened and officials reinstated pending an enquiry."

The proceedings were adjourned until the following night, when the General Secretary attended on the invitation of the members. That worthy individual stated that the present position had arisen through there being too much Communism and too much rank-and-file control in the branch. When a Press reporter interviewed Cotter on the subject, and Fiery Joe explained that the Liverpool branch was being run by the Communist element, the local officials repudiated the implication, and admitted the majority of them were members of the Masonic Order.

After this meeting conferences were held every day of lay members and ex-officials, and deputations were continually visiting the General Secretary and newly-imported District Secretary, in order to have the branches re-opened, but all to no avail.

The deputation finally decided to set up a council of action, which drafted a policy to be submitted to the members at the following branch meeting, the cost of same being borne out of subscriptions, because the Head Office officials deprived us of the use of a hall.

In the presence of a crowded meeting, the Council of Action was endorsed and resolutions were unanimously carried demanding the reopening of all the branch offices and the reinstatement of the officials pending an enquiry.

A reporter of the *Daily Herald* was present, but no report found its way into the columns of "the only Labour (?) daily." When you realise that Bob Williams is a member of the Finance Committee of the A.M.W.U., and also

a director of the *Daily Herald*, the reason is obvious.

Next day, Friday, May 5th, the Council of Action began to make a move. An advance guard was sent out to take possession of the branch offices, which had been reopened the same day by officials from other ports, who did not know the real nature of the situation. The advance guard walked into the nearest office, took the occupants by surprise, demanded the keys, and then installed the ex-officials to carry the business out on behalf of the members. Similar tactics were used in taking over the Central Office in North John Street, where the General Secretary was in charge. The lady typists were a bit afraid at first, but were reassured when the intruders began to resume the duties agreed upon. A third branch was captured, and in each instance the police were brought in to scare us, but were ordered off the premises and have not troubled us since.

The news of the coup reached the ears of Have-lock Wilson, who sent an emissary, saying he was prepared to meet a deputation on condition that certain ex-members of the Vigilance Committee did not form part of it. A deputation reached London on Sunday, May 7th, and were conveyed to the headquarters of Father Neptune by motor-car. The usual "stage properties" were shown to the deputation by a guide, whose powers of speech had been strengthened by a liberal supply of whiskey given by Have-a-drop Wilson at the expense of the men who go down to the sea in ships. The deputation were shown a small bed supported by a piece of timber, covered with sparse bedclothing, where, due to his poverty-stricken circumstances, etc., the "old man of the sea" was compelled to rest his weary bones. This, of course, was intended to dispel any impression that may have existed in the minds of the deputation that Have-it-all wine and slept in luxurious surroundings. Wilson arrived on the scene, and after professing to have an inside knowledge of the new Union, and criticising Cotter and Shinwell, declaring the former to be an autocrat, suggested that he would finance the ex-officials to fight Cotter, if they would transfer to the N.S. and F.U., bringing the members with them. He did not forget to point out that he was skipper in the N.S. and F.U., and while he remained on the bridge his word must be obeyed.

The report of the deputation was given on Monday to the Council of Action and ex-officials, who unanimously decided: "That Wilson's offer be rejected, and we have no further interviews with him." Many of those who proclaimed themselves as Masons spoke vigorously in support of the resolution, and declared they would sooner tramp the streets than touch Wilson with a 40-ft. pole.

The offices were held for four days. On the fifth morning we discovered the locks had been removed during the night and replaced by new ones, making the keys in our possession valueless. Oil for the troubled waters arrived in the person of Shinwell, the national organiser, who suggested, if possible, that a delegate meeting representative of all the branches in the country meet in Liverpool to try and straighten the affair.

While this situation exists the seamen are being exploited more than any other body of men in the country. Between over-work and starvation at sea, and the piling up of enormous profits for the shipowners on one hand, and the crimps, unscrupulous adventurers, political fakirs who sabotage him on the other, to repeat the name of a popular song, "E dunno where 'E are."

Past experiences are teaching a lesson, and despite the machinations of the leech variety mentioned in the last paragraph, the fakirs fight amongst themselves to be king of the castle, while at the same time yelling the hackneyed phrases, "Some Trades Unionism," accompanied by the cries of the shipowners "for longer hours," "no overtime pay," and "lower wages."

From the fore-castle and "glory hole," from the stokehold and the crow's nest is hurled back the demand for one big industrial union that will navigate the treacherous seas of Capitalism and discharge us in the long-sought-for haven of the Industrial Commonwealth.

GEORGE GARRETT.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM? The Fallacies of a Debate.

What is Communism? Surely everyone should know that to-day.

Communism is a classless order of society in which property is held in common, production is for the common use, there is no money or wages, no buying and selling or barter, no employers and employed, all are entitled to the free use of social products, each person takes according to need, and each one gives according to capability. All this is clear.

Nevertheless, at a debate between official spokesmen of the Communist Party of Great Britain (Third International) and the Independent Labour Party, it was assumed on both sides that the tactics of the Third International are Communism; in fact, that Communism, instead of being a social system, is a question of a certain political party's tactics and methods of struggling to attain to power.

Communism itself had no part in the debate, though Palme Dutt had every opportunity to introduce it in criticising the I.L.P. policy. He observed that the I.L.P. produces each year a new programme for the future "Socialist Commonwealth," but he makes no criticism of the I.L.P. constitution for the coming Commonwealth, which, of course, is not a Socialist Commonwealth at all.

Here is the I.L.P. programme just issued:—

"The Socialist Commonwealth is that State of Society in which Land and Capital are communally owned, and the processes of production, distribution, and exchange are social functions."

"The Independent Labour Party believes in democracy organised both in its political and industrial aspects, for communal ends."

"The basis of political democracy must be the whole body of citizens, exercising authority through a national representative assembly, directly elected by the people, with a decentralised and extended system of local government."

"The basis of industrial democracy must be: (1) The organisation of the wage and salary earners; and (2) the organisation of consumers. must decide the amount and character of communal production and service necessary. The internal management of each industry must be in the hands of the workers, administrative, technical and manual, engaged therein, operating in conjunction with the representatives of the organised consumers. Experience will determine the methods of co-operation and the detailed form of organisation, as step by step is taken towards the attainment of the Socialist Commonwealth."

Mr. Palme Dutt did not point out that this scheme of the I.L.P. is by no means Communism, and is, of course, merely a poor, unpractical half-way house thereto. Note, there are still to be the salary earners and the wage earners!

The term Socialism was as grossly misused as Communism.

Again and again both Palme Dutt, of the Communist Party (Right Wing), and Ernest E. Hunter, of the I.L.P., N.A.C., asserted that there is State Socialism in Russia, entirely ignoring the fact that the land of Russia is privately worked by the peasants, that vast tracts of it are being offered for private capitalist exploitation, and that the industries are fast passing away from the State into private hands.

Mr. Hunter actually stated that "There is State Socialism in a most perfect form in Queensland," and Palme Dutt allowed this more than once repeated assertion to pass without comment. The fact, of course, is, as most of our readers are aware, that whilst certain services have been nationalised in Queensland, the great bulk of production and distribution is still carried on there by private enterprise.

One was driven to the conclusion that to at least one member of the I.L.P. executive, State Socialism merely means that there is a Labour Party Government in office, however reactionary, or powerless to combat capitalism the Labour Party Cabinet may be.

Neither Communism, nor Socialism, in the true sense of those terms, ever found its way into that most absurd debate.

The debate hinged purely upon the immediate tactical policy in the class struggle of the two rival parties; but, strangely enough, neither spokesman appeared to be aware of the actual policy of his Party, for both described it as being something quite other than it is.

Hunter declared that the special policy of the I.L.P. is to explain Socialism, whereas it is notorious that an explanation of Socialism is the last thing one expects to hear from an I.L.P. platform. In spite of his continual assertion that the special business of the I.L.P. is to teach Socialism, Mr. Hunter himself explained why, nevertheless, the I.L.P. does not give this teaching. He said:—

"When it is a question of Socialist administration and Socialist victories, we are bound to temporise."

That, of course, means: When it is a question of getting a seat, or keeping a seat on a publicly-elected body, the I.L.P. finds it advisable not to teach Socialism or anything else that is thought extreme, but to tune its song with reference to the existing prejudices and political backwardness of the electorate.

The first business of the I.L.P. is obviously to win elections, not to teach Socialism. Ask Mr. Ramsay MacDonald whether he concentrates his attention on the teaching of pure Socialism.

Palme Dutt, however, accepted Hunter's statement that the I.L.P. is devoting its attention to the teaching of Socialism. He did not dissent from Hunter's statement that the Communist Party is not teaching Communism, but is merely preparing for the revolution. Instead of replying that Hunter was wrong, Palme Dutt boasted that the principal work done by the Communist Party (Third International) is preparation for revolution; for the joining of the final struggle between the working class and the capitalists, in which capitalism will be overthrown.

Herein Mr. Palme Dutt showed a woeful ignorance of the policy of his own Party. It is true that the Communist Party (Third International) has abandoned any serious attempt to teach Communism; it has substituted demands for the eight-hour day and other slogans of the United Front. It has also substituted for the policy of international revolution the policy of peace and trade between capitalism and Soviet Russia. This is why the policy of forming Revolutionary Industrial Unions built up from the workshops is opposed in favour of bolstering up of the Trade Unions. This is why the United Front has been devised. Why? Because the policy of "peace and trade" with capitalism requires the support of the British Labour Party and Trade Union Congress, and that of the reactionary Right Wing Socialist Members of Parliament and Trade Unions of the other countries.

Had Soviet Russia approved the German one big Revolutionary Union in opposition to the Scheideman-Noske Trade Unions of Germany, the Russo-Germany Treaty would not have been signed. The Third International, which is entirely dominated by the persons who form the Russian Soviet Government, believes that the British Labour Party may soon form a British Government, and even if it does not, its advocacy of "peace and trade" with Russia is a useful lever in preparing the Governments in power to adopt that policy. So it is in the other countries. If the Soviet Government and the Third International were still preparing for Communism and the revolution, the reactionary Labour and Social Democratic Parties would not be advocating "peace and trade" with Soviet Russia. In any case, the peace and trade policy; the Genos policy is incompatible with the revolutionary policy.

In the days when the Third International was revolutionary, it scouted the policy of the "United Front" and declared that that policy had been the undoing of the Second International and had necessitated the creation of the Third.

Hunter observed that he thought it rather a mistake to debate the differences between the C.P. and the I.L.P. He would prefer to discover their points of unity. Palme Dutt, however, said that the I.L.P., because it refuses to prepare for civil war, because it does not advocate the use of force by the working class, is taking its stand on the side of the force employed by the capitalist state, since the capitalist state is maintained by force. He pointed out

that the I.L.P. demands that the Soviet Government shall not apply capital punishment to the Social Revolutionaries and others who have fought against it, and demands representations at the Commission of Inquiry into these cases. The I.L.P. does not make similar claims upon the capitalist Government in the case of the Rand strikers.

This was Palme Dutt's best point; but, of course, Hunter might have replied, "We expect better things from the Soviet Government than from capitalist Governments, and we know that it is useless for us to make representation to the South African Government, whereas the Soviet has acceded to our demands. We have therefore shown ourselves Realists."

Palme Dutt scouted the idea of unity with the I.L.P. on the ground that the I.L.P. pacifism is a support to the maintenance of the present system. Hunter justly replied by reminding Palme Dutt that the Communist Party proposed the United Front. Truly it is absurd for the Third International to desire unity with the pro-war Government Socialist and Labour Parties and at the same time to grow squeamish about the I.L.P. pacifism! The I.L.P. pacifism at least held out, on the whole, against the capitalist war, whilst the jingoism of the Labour Party and Social Democrats engaged in recruiting for it and assisted in the conscription of the workers for the front and the militarisation of their labour at home. Those who are prepared to enter the party of Henderson, who was in the Coalition Cabinet, who deported the Clyde shop stewards, and made himself responsible for the Munitions Act, the secret treaties, the torture of C.O.'s, the intervention in Russia and the welcome to Kerensky, and who have actually made a leader of their party of Cachin, who toured on behalf of the French Government to bring Italy into the War, need not shrink from the I.L.P., although we have to admit it is drifting further to the Right and becoming more like the Labour Party every day.

On this point Hunter made a pregnant observation, which every member of the C.P. who still retains any Communist and revolutionary views should seriously consider. He said: "You of the C.P. are engaged in doing what we are doing, capturing power in the Trades Councils and Labour Parties. Whilst you are doing that you are encountering the steady deterioration, from the Socialist point of view, of the members you send in to do that work."

Hunter was absolutely right in that observation: he spoke from experience. In doing so he bore out our contention that a Communist organisation must not affiliate to a non-Communist organisation, and that the united front is opposed to the progress of Communism. Hunter asked what practical difference is there to be found between Colonel Malone, M.P., of the Communist Party, and Neil Maclean, M.P., of the I.L.P.; between Messrs. Watts and Butler, L.C.C., C.P., or Messrs. Ammon and Snell, L.C.C., I.L.P.; or between two such Mayors as Major Atlee, I.L.P., and Joe Vaughan, C.P.?

Palme Dutt replied that Robert Smillie, I.L.P., had accepted the Coal Commission on the Government promise that its findings would be accepted, and now had said he would not have done so had he known the Government would break its promise. Dutt contended that the Communist Party would not have made that mistake. Hunter replied: "Of course they would; they would have jumped at the Coal Commission, because they would have said it would advertise their cause."

We think, knowing the C.P.G.B. and its personnel, that Hunter was right. Nevertheless, the Third International in Moscow would have opposed acceptance of the Coal Commission in its early revolutionary days: it would certainly accept it now.

Palme Dutt attributed to the policy which accepted the Coal Commission the collapse of the miners' movement. The reason of the collapse of the miners' movement is that it was a bubble reformist movement subsisting on catch cries and bluff, and lacked any widespread desire to overthrow the capitalist movement. Therefore it was bound to temporise and bound to collapse with the advent of bad trade.

Instead of endeavouring to build up a genuine Communist revolutionary movement, the policy of the C.P.G.B. is simply to go on repeating the

palliative catch cries and to win a cheap popularity which fails to create a Communist movement of action and determination. The short-cut policy produces only the bubble movement over again.

Palme Dutt repeated the oft-repeated lies that the working class has got the power in Russia though capitalism daily extends its power there and workers' control has passed away.

First the industrial workers seized the factories and administered them.

Then partially-elected, partially-appointed Committees of Management took over the management.

Then management by one man appointed from outside replaced the Committees.

First lodging, fuel and light, and essential food and clothing, travelling facilities, postage, amusements, etc., were free: one could live without money. These things were, moreover, divided equally, except that the manual worker, and the soldier, had higher food rations than sedentary workers, and children had preference in milk, eggs, etc. Wages and salaries were not equal; but these only earned the extras. In 1920 equal food rationing ceased; responsible workers began to get better food; the "new economic" policy of reversion to capitalism followed. Markets at which general purchases could be made were illegal at the beginning of 1921. As the Russian Information and Review has it:—

"With the introduction of the new economic policy private trading became legal, and the free market began to receive an increasingly dominant importance; and, as a result, the money payment of wages became a growing value."

With the new economic policy, factories began passing over from the Soviet State control to private enterprise. Vast tracts of Russian land containing oil and other natural resources are being offered wholesale for capitalist exploitation; says the Russian Information and Review:

"The opportunities for foreign capital are undoubtedly immense."

As to the land, the revolution gave the land to the peasants. Broadly speaking, the peasants took the land from the landlords, cut it up into strips, one for each family to work as its own private property; and except for the State requisitions for the bread monopoly, and so on, the peasants bartered or sold for money their individual produce.

Apart from the fact that quantities of land, including part of the Black Belt, the richest soil of Russia, are being sold for capitalist enterprise, new laws are now being made regarding the land held by the peasants.

Says the Russian Information and Review:—

"In the primitive Russian Commune the peasants generally cultivate the ground in common, but reserve the produce of particular strips for each individual family. These strips are re-distributed every few years."

This practice was by no means universal in Russia in the period prior to the revolution, nor has it been since. The rich peasant, the middle peasant, and the poor peasant have not disappeared. We should like to know how far the primitive commune as above described now exists, and what proportion of the land it covers.

Be that as it may, new decrees now lay down that a peasant living in such a commune, without leaving his house or village, may break away from the commune and work land individually apart from it, either alone or in co-operation with others. He may also employ hired labour (which was not hitherto permitted) if he is short of labour for his holding. He may even lease land provided he is working and not living wholly on his property. (See Russian Information and Review, May 15th, page 367.)

So Russia goes slipping back into capitalism. Yet the members of the Third International refuse to admit that anything is changed, and still declare that in Russia the proletariat is in control.

SYLVIA PANKHURST.

LEAKEY'S

INTRODUCTION TO ESPERANTO

La Lingvo Internacia

Price 4d., post free.

Clear, simple and entertaining for students of all ages. Specially recommended for Proletarian Schools and Classes.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

A CRITICAL APPRECIATION

By ROSA LUXEMBURG.

(Translated from the German by M. CAMPBELL.)

II.

The Bolsheviks are the historic successors of the English Levellers and the French Jacobins. The concrete task that has devolved upon the Russian Revolutionists since they seized the power is, however, much more difficult than that of their historic predecessors. (Consider the importance of the agrarian problem from so far back as 1905. Then the Right Wing of the peasantry in the 3rd Duma! Consider the peasant problem and defence, the Army.)

Undoubtedly the slogan of "the immediate seizure and partition of the land by the peasants" was the simplest, shortest, and most concise formula for accomplishing two things—the abolition of the big landed estates, and attaching the peasants at once to the revolutionary Government.

These, as political measures, were excellent tactics for consolidating the proletarian Socialist Government. Unfortunately, however, there are two sides to the question, the reverse one being that the immediate seizure of the land by the peasants has practically nothing in common with Socialist economy.

The Socialist re-shaping of rural economic conditions and relationships pre-supposes two things:

Firstly, land nationalisation; aiming primarily at the big estates, and understood to be, in a technical sense, the most progressive manner of concentrating the agrarian means and methods of production, which alone can serve as a basis of Socialist agrarian economy. If one is to make the petty peasant feel that his plot will not be taken away, and that he need not be anxious as to his security of tenure; if he is to be shown the advantages which joint production will bring him; if he is voluntarily to join a co-operative society, and thus learn how to take up a right attitude towards the industrial life of the whole community, it naturally follows that every Socialist economic agrarian reform will have to start with the big and medium-sized estates. It must be a question here of surrendering ownership of property to the nation, or, if one prefers the term, to the State, which is the same thing if a Socialist Government is in power. Only the surrender of property to the nation can guarantee the possibility of organising agricultural production on Socialist lines.

Secondly, it must be taken for granted, in this re-shaping of conditions, that there shall be an end of the cleavage between agriculture and industry, which is characteristic of bourgeois society. This cleavage must end in order to get both agriculture and industry working together to their mutual advantage, and to make room for a development of both agrarian and industrial production along uniform lines.

Let the detailed plan of this effective control be what it may, whether placed in the hands of the municipal authorities, as some people advocate, or whether it rests with the central body set up by the State; in any case, it pre-supposes a reform introduced, imposed, and carried through by a centralised authority, which takes as its indispensable basis the nationalisation of the land.

The nationalisation of the big and medium-sized estates, and the unification of industry and agriculture are the two basic foundations of every Socialist economic reform, without which there cannot be Socialism.

Is it discreditable that the Soviet Government has not carried out these gigantic reforms in Russia? It would be going rather too far to demand, or to expect, from Lenin and his comrades that they should have solved, during the short time they have been in power, one of the most difficult problems; indeed, we may say the most difficult of the Socialist Revolution. It must be remembered that they have had to face a situation in which everything is being whirled into a vortex of internal and external conflicts, and have been faced with enemies and opposition from all quarters. When we in Western Europe finally come into power we shall also break many

teeth in trying to crack this hard nut, before we surmount the thousand-and-one difficulties of our gigantic task, even under the most favourable circumstances.

Any Socialist Government must, whatever happens, do one essential thing: it must take such measures as will prepare a fundamental basis for eventually settling agrarian conditions and relationships on Socialist lines; it must at least avoid everything that would stand in the way of the Socialist solution.

The watchword of the Bolsheviks: "Immediate confiscation and apportionment of the land and the estates by the peasants," must of necessity act in opposition to Socialism. Not only is it not a Socialist measure, it actually bars the way to Socialism. It puts insuperable difficulties in the way of re-shaping agrarian conditions and relationships on a Socialist basis.

The confiscation of the farm lands by the peasants, who acted in response to the watchword of Lenin and his friends: "Go and take unto yourselves the land," led to a sudden stir and commotion; a chaotic passage from big landed property to peasant landed property.

What we now see created is not Communal property, but a new kind of private property. In other words, the landed properties have been parcelled out in medium-sized and small possessions, so that a relatively progressive big industry has been battered into a primitive small industry, of which the technical means of production belong to the days of the Pharaohs.

As a result of this measure, and of the chaotic and purely capricious manner in which it has been carried out, we find that in the rural districts the social distinctions arising from property holding have not been effaced, but have been aggravated. Although the Bolsheviks invited the peasants to form Peasant Committees, in order to make the confiscation of the land of the nobility appear to be the result of mass action, it is plain that the actual state of affairs and the social relationship determined by the wielding of power which existed in the rural districts could not be altered in the least by such general advice. Committees or no committees, the wealthy peasants and profiteers, who constitute the village bourgeoisie, and who have, in every Russian village, managed to get all the local power of any importance into their hands, are bound to be the people who reap the greatest benefit from the agrarian revolution. Anyone can see at once that the result of the apportionment of the land has not been to abolish, but only to aggravate, the social and economic inequalities which existed within the peasant population. The class antagonisms amongst the peasantry have become more acute. Moreover, the shifting of power has been to the detriment of proletarian and Socialist interests. Formerly it could always be reckoned that a Socialist agrarian reform would meet with resistance from a small clique of large aristocratic and capitalist landed proprietors, and from the small wealthy village bourgeoisie. To expropriate such a tiny minority as these persons amounted to is mere child's play to the great revolutionary masses. Now, however, since the "seizure" of land by the peasants, we find that all attempt to bring Socialist ideas to bear upon agriculture meets with the hostile resistance of a strong and enormously increased mass of peasant owners, who are prepared to fight tooth and nail against all Socialist "outrages" upon their newly-acquired property.

Thus, the question of the future socialisation of the agricultural industry in Russia (which means, of course, the socialisation of production itself) has become a question that has thrown the peasant masses and the urban proletariat into fierce opposition and open conflict. That this opposition has already assumed large dimensions is proved by the boycott of the towns by the peasants. By refusing to send foodstuffs to the towns, the peasants endeavour to set up as profiteers, and so followed in the footsteps of the

(Continued on page 8.)

:: CORRESPONDENCE. ::

FROM NEW ZEALAND.

A comrade writes:—

"The growers of Bowen, Queensland, formed a Co-operative Association for their mutual aid and advantage. There was one dissident. No! He wouldn't join their jolly old Union. He would send his pumpkins and things on his own!

"On carting his stuff to the train he found that the Co-operative men would not let his stuff within ten thousand miles of it; not they!

"Reactionary townsmen patted him on the back. They called him 'a b— fine fellow,' and all that, and sent for blackleg labour to load his stuff into the truck.

"The Union leaders threatened the blacklegs with unprintable tortures if they attempted to go near their train, and the backsliders were not game to go near them. Australians do not seem to have a grain of that respect for 'lorand-order' so common in England.

"Lord Northcliffe has been touring here. He says that though the Australians are a 'fine, free, hospitable, etc., people,' they do not seem to realise the character and tenacity of the Britisher. Poor fellows: how misguided they are! The fact is, they do not appreciate Uncle five heads over much. He is probably a bit marked at not having impressed hard-bitten workmen into touching their hats to him. The papers have made fun of him, too. I suppose he forgot they did not belong to him as they do in his native land.

"Conan Doyle was another washout. His tour could not be called much of a success. The regrettable tendency of people here to heckle, 'barrack,' as it is called here, spoiled one of his serious attempts to explain spiritualism. He found the Australians dreadfully lacking in spiritual mindedness, or some such woeful quality."

THE PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM.

DEAR COMRADE,—

I have followed with interest the various letters with regard to Communism in practice, and I am sure that now is the time for anyone who believes in it to put same into effect as far as they possibly can under the present system.

The letter by "A. Y. C." seems to me to show how simple the thing is if only there are a few willing to carry out the ideas.

The writer of that letter does not, however, make it clear as to who is to provide the necessary materials for the different things that may be required. I take it, though, that what is meant is:—

1. That the comrade who requires a new hinge on a meat safe would supply all the necessary materials, the comrade who did the work just giving his time.

2. That the comrade who could make the pastry would just go to the house of the comrade who required it—giving his (or her) time—and would be supplied with all the necessary ingredients for making the pastry.

With regard to the letter from "D. T.," I agree that the organisation of the food supply is the most vital factor; but, of course, we must be content to start in a very small way, and cannot, therefore, anticipate dealing with this question at first; but a start could be made in the way suggested in "A. Y. L.'s" letter—i.e., by the cultivation of an allotment or allotments and the keeping of chickens, extending this side of the work as the idea grew.

One thing we must be ready to face is the starting in a very small way indeed, and not keep on postponing our start by saying, "Oh, there are not enough of us to make a start."

Why, when one thinks of these things, cannot we say it is what we do every day of our life amongst our friends? Why not, therefore, agree to broaden the thing out and do it to those who may not, perhaps, come under the term "friend"?

A YOUNG CONVERT.

THE CULT OF THE DEAD.

BY AN IRISH RANK AND FILE.

One of the peculiar characteristics of the Irish race is the cult of the dead. The Irish as a general rule are quite ready to give honour to a great Irishman, but he must die first. While he is alive he finds great difficulty in getting a meal, especially if he has a powerful personality and is a revolutionary force people tight shy of him. The politician, on the other hand, is worshipped during his lifetime, because he always follows the line of least resistance, and never asks his followers to do anything that might in any way inconvenience them. The rebel follows the path that leads to trouble and the prison cell. For this reason, the mass of the people prefer to wait for his death to sing his praises.

Thus it is that James Connolly fed in the Mendicinity institution while he was alive, and nobody bothered very much about his literary merits. Now every mealy-mouthed politician drags in his name wherever possible, and the multitude uncovers for it.

We have another case in point in Ireland at the present time. Jim Larkin is the greatest power in the Labour movement in Ireland. He is in gaol in the United States. His name is a household word even yet in Dublin. The Irish bosses fear him worse than the proverbial devil fears holy water. Yet the leaders of the Irish Labour movement are using every means in their power to drown his memory. Every week in their official organ the writings of Connolly are published. Why? Not because these men loved Connolly, but because Connolly is dead and he is no longer a danger to the reactionaries. There is not one word about Larkin. Why? Because Larkin is alive and a living danger to their power and their jobs if he were to come back. The average dishonest labour union official in Ireland will tell you that Jim was a great fellow, but crazy. He was no good to build up an organisation. He was always in trouble—strikes, gaol sentences, libel actions, etc. He would waste the funds feeding the hungry among the Union members. You may remonstrate with the Labour official; you may say that a trade union should not be a business proposition, but an organisation of mutual aid among the workers, to help one another in difficulty, and carry on the fight against the bosses in the best way possible until the advent of Communism. Then the Labour official will laugh at you and say that you are a Communist.

Now in Ireland at the present time there is a powerful Labour Union machine, the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union. It is probably the strongest Union in these islands. Yet the Irish workers, from a trade union point of view, were never so badly off as they are at the present time. There are a number of bureaucrats with large salaries at the head of the organisation, who rule the masses under them with an iron hand. Any man who is discovered to have revolutionary views is victimised. Strong propaganda is being sent out from Liberty Hall every week to the various branch officials condemning Larkinism and undermining Larkin's influence.

This is a definite policy adopted to prepare for the eventuality of Larkin's return. If he returned, his revolutionary policy would not result in any great acquisition to their luxury. William O'Brien would not be able to ride about in limousines with Mr. David Barry, of the Port and Docks Board; and Mr. Foran might be forced to leave the racecourse and get behind the barricades. Mr. Johnson, in particular, has been cleverest in this scientific sabotage against the influence of Larkin. He, no doubt, is most conscious that the interests of the friendly organisation to which he is reputed to belong would be irretrievably injured by the return of such a rebel. However, this policy is now being exposed to the Irish workers. Little indiscretions on the part of the rulers of Liberty Hall, who had succeeded until now in imposing on foreign comrades as genuine Reds, are showing the Irish workers how they have been fooled. An Irishman is easily fooled, but when he discovers the fraud he is liable to take drastic action. The clever plans laid by the present Labour leaders in Dublin had very nearly succeeded, but owing to the watchfulness of the few rebels left in the Union they have been at length discovered.

It is well that comrades in foreign countries, before giving credence to reports about the Labour movement in Ireland, should examine the source of this information. In England, especially, where the working class is at the mercy of the Labour lieutenants of the Boss Class, they should easily understand that the Executive Committee of a union must be reactionary when there are scabs working in the headquarters in Dublin, while the old staff are walking the streets on strike. Further, it is the duty of every class-conscious worker to denounce those who are in office, living on the result of a gaol'd revolutionary's efforts, whilst using every means in their power to keep that rebel in gaol.

We call for the support of our English comrades to aid us in the effort to bring Larkin back. It is enough for a man to suffer imprisonment at the hands of his enemies, without being reviled and discredited by the very men he raised from the gutter. The situation in Ireland calls for the firm hand of a class-conscious leader. Time servers and poltroon politicians are at hand and in power. RANK AND FILE.

JUST OUT.

DESIRABLE MANSIONS.

By Edward Carpenter.

A TELLING SATIRE.

Price - 4d.

FROM "THE DREADNOUGHT" BOOKSHOP.
152 Fleet Street, London E.C.4.

A MASSACRE OF A PEACEFUL PEOPLE.

A HUNDRED HOUSES REDUCED TO ASHES.

A WOMAN BURNT ALIVE.

We recently published information from an Indian correspondent regarding the massacre of the Bhils of the native state of Gujarat by British troops because the Bhils had refused to pay their taxes in order to secure redress of grievances. We have now received the report on the Bhil situation by a deputation sent by Sewa Sangra and Rajputana Central Indian People's Association, signed by B. S. Pathick.

After the massacre already reported, the authorities urged the Bhils to pay first and leave their grievances to be dealt with later, but the Bhils refused to pay the taxes—at least until they had assembled in general conference to decide whether they should alter their policy. The troops of the state, taking Mr. Pritchard, a British official, with them as adviser, marched to the village of Sirea. The Bhils of the village believed, as a result of experience, that the troops had come either to arrest or to kill them. Many Bhils took to flight, but those who remained declared they would maintain their determination to pay taxes only after the redress of grievances. The troops approached the Bhils. One of the Bhils who had seen Mr. Pritchard at the previous massacre now cried:

"Such white people deceived and killed us before."

The Bhil uncovered his rude little knife and prepared to defend himself.

Mr. Pritchard, who had been in front of the troops, now retired behind them, and from a safe distance brandished his loaded revolver. The Bhils now reproached their comrade for showing his knife, as they feared that trouble would result.

Next day the officers summoned the Bhils from several villages, and ordered them to pay the taxes; but they refused, in spite of all the threats. The Bhils of Sawaya were summoned to come to the officers, but refused. Thereupon the troops fired a cannon into the village and the houses, filled with fuel grass and highly-inflammable, were set alight. The flames spread throughout the village, sparing neither grain, nor cattle, nor agricultural instruments. A pregnant woman, too ill to escape, was burnt to death in one of the houses, her cries for help unheeded by the troops. The fleeing people were fired on by the troops, and a large number were killed. The exact number is not yet known. Houses for some distance around the village were also burnt. The deputation saw an old man of a hundred years lying helpless at some distance from the village. He had been wounded in the head, and the soldiers had robbed him as he lay.

The deputation visited some of the State officials, who declared that such barbarities were unavoidable if the prestige of the State were to be maintained.

TOM ANDERSON IN LONDON.

Comrade Tom Anderson, of Glasgow, well known as a pioneer of the Proletarian Schools, is coming to London for a series of meetings lasting from Friday, June 7th, to Sunday, June 18th, inclusive. He will speak during the period as follows:—

Friday, June 9th. Poplar Town Hall, Dance, 7.30-12 p.m., to meet Comrade Tom Anderson, who will deliver a short address. Music by East London Labour Band. Admission, 1s. 6d. Refreshments at popular prices.

Saturday, June 10th.—3 p.m., Catherine Road, East Ham; 8 p.m., Beckton Road, Canning Town.

Sunday, June 11th.—11 a.m., Peckham Rye; 3 p.m., Parliament Hill; 7 p.m., Finsbury Park.

Monday, June 12th.—Noon, Tower Hill; 8 p.m., Water Lane, Stratford.

Tuesday, June 13th.—Noon, Albert Dock, Connaught Road; 8 p.m., Tottenham Corner.

Wednesday, June 14th.—Noon, Leather Lane; 8 p.m., Wren Road, Camberwell.

Thursday, June 15th.—Noon, Arsenal, Woolwich; 8 p.m., Minerva Café, At Home.

Friday, June 16th.—Noon, Victoria Road, Custom House; 8 p.m., East India Dock Gates.

Saturday, June 17th.—3 p.m., Clapham Common; 8 p.m., The Grove, Hammersmith.

Sunday, June 18th.—11 a.m., Victoria Park; 3.30 p.m., Trafalgar Square.

IF THE UNEMPLOYED WENT RED.

Sir P. C. Roy, one of the leaders of the Indian non-Co-operation Movement, at Kustia, in Bengal, on March 6th, had a talk with some of his own people over there in India, which is reported in *Karmi*, a newspaper published by the clerks of Calcutta. Some of Sir P. C. Roy's remarks were of considerable interest to us, fellow-workers. He said:

"At the advent of the British merchant, the people of Bengal were found quite indispensable to British trade. By working for British firms they soon became very rich and acquired many landed estates [that means the Indian boss class, fellow-worker, not the working people, who become poorer, not richer].

"The descendants of the Indians who helped the British traders, instead of taking to trade and commerce on their own account, passed their lives in dissipation." [They did not realise, fellow-worker, that real wealth and power resides in possession of the means of life—food, clothing, housing, and all the necessities of society. They left these to the exploitation of the foreigner.]

"The Hindu College and other educational institutions were established, every educated person found employment, either as deputy munsiff, or lawyers, and the country was being equipped with networks of law courts." [The number of useless parasites who fattened on the toilers who fed, clothed, and housed the population of India was thereby increased, fellow-worker.]

"No notice was taken by the rich and educated Indians at Bengal of trade and commerce. Foreigners and strangers availed themselves of the opportunity, and established a lasting hold on the trade and commerce of Bengal. Ninety-five per cent. of its wealth is now in the hands of foreigners. The Bengalees are now only employment seekers in their own country; they have lost the proprietorship of the real wealth of the country."

[Why, fellow-worker, that is just your position, is it not?]

"Every year Bengal has to export 20 crores of rupees for cloth only. Bengal cannot grow rich so long as this sort of commercial dependence continues."

[Nor you, fellow-worker, whilst you are the serf of the shopkeeper, the middleman, and the boss.]

"To start new mills in Bengal, to clothe her people, is out of the question; for an up-to-date cotton mill will cost 25 lacs of rupees for machinery, besides exorbitant or prohibitive import duties. But Bengal cannot sit idly if she is ever to live. The people must take to charka [the spinning-wheel].

"If every family owns one charka (spinning-wheel) and ten or twenty cotton plants, we can save at least one crore of rupees a year, if on an average five members of each family spin for half-an-hour daily."

[Some effort that, is it not, fellow-worker?]

"Bengal is an agricultural country, and the people have to work for their agriculture only for three months in the year; the remaining nine months being spent in idleness, they can utilise the time by working on the spinning-wheel. They must work their own way out. Their precarious condition is of their own make. It is their hankering for 'ready-made service' and inveterate idleness that have made them so.

[It seems that the lawyer class and the rich, who do not work even three months in agriculture, are those who must first be accused of idleness: theirs was the class which sold India to the foreigner. (O, Soviet delegate at Genoa!)]

"Still, there is time to avert the ruin. Take to charka and learn the dignity of labour."

Now that is very interesting, is it not, fellow-worker? You will ask, perhaps, why the Indians do not seize the mills and factories which the foreigner has planted in their midst, instead of going back to the primitive methods of home and hand production, which Sir C. P. Roy and other non-co-operators are urging.

All in due time, they certainly will seize the mills and factories, fellow-worker; of course they will. At present the non-co-operation movement is finding its way from strength to strength. It is partly designed to injure the British exploiter by boycotting his products; it is also intended to arouse the sense of independence in the Indian people, and to give them an opportunity to develop its practice. They will grow in self-reliance and courage to overthrow the foreign domination by this means.

Do you think that it is only independence of the foreign capitalist that the Indian people will learn from charka? Will they wrest their industry from the foreign capitalist, only to give it back to the home capitalist? That would be folly indeed, would it not, fellow-worker?

There are, however, bad possibilities, as well as good, in the charka movement, fellow-worker. The bad tendency is that which would make every individual a petty producer, producing every single thing that he uses for his or her immediate self and family, without thought of the general welfare. Home growing of cotton, home spinning and weaving of cloth is too primitive a method of supply; it necessitates over-work for everyone, and affords only a scant supply for anyone; because it discards all the means of quick and easy production which human ingenuity has discovered during the capitalist period, and because it discards the benefits of co-operative work and mutual aid. The Indian people, and any others striving to emancipate themselves from capitalism, must work in co-operation, share their products in common, practise mutual aid between industry and industry; individual and individual, and as soon as possible the use of machinery and scientific facilities.

But let us consider the unemployed in this island of ours. Is it not strange, fellow-worker, that they are more helpless than the savage? All they can do is to "go to the Guardians." (If you go to the Guardians at the Sick Asylum in Devons Road, Bow, in the Borough of Poplar, they will put you in a bug-ridden bed, fellow-worker; we have it direct from one of the Guardians that Sick Asylum beds are being burnt, owing to the atrocious dirt and neglect which has obtained there.)

The unemployed, be it observed, are more hopeless than savages; they go to the Guardians, and the Guardians are now more and more disposed to send them down to the Labour Colonies at Hollesley Bay, Belmont, and elsewhere. A comrade tells us he is going to Belmont to work on the land in return for his food and 6d. a week pocket money. Another comrade tells us he is going to Hollesley Bay for 2s. 6d. a week pocket money, but 1s. a week out of that is saved up for him till he goes.

At Hollesley Bay the unemployed went on strike for better conditions. (Oh, naughty! naughty! They forgot they were poverty's prisoners!) They held a meeting in the village. The boss whom the Guardians had placed over them grew angry and sent them back to London.

But suppose the unemployed at Hollesley Bay and Belmont, and the other colonies, really went Red. Suppose they took control of those colonies and began working them as the nucleus of the Communist Soviet Republic that will one day be set up in Britain. Suppose they had held a business meeting with the railwaymen, and arranged with them that no one and nothing should be brought down to the Labour Colony without permission of the workers there. Suppose they had seized the telephonic and telegraphic communications. Suppose they had held a business meeting with the villages and arranged to act with them on principles of Communist mutual aid.

Suppose they issued a call to the workers in every kind of service to follow their example. Then they would be the first to hoist the Red Flag in this island. If it were soon hauled down for the time-being they would sow a pregnant seed. We expect it to happen at any time.

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.—Continued from page 6.
Prussian Junkers. The French peasants who received their portion of the land which the Revolution had confiscated from the emigrants became in return the bravest defenders of the great French Revolution. As Napoleonic soldiers they carried the French flag to victory, and went from one end of Europe to the other, destroying feudalism wherever they found it. Lenin and his friends may have expected a similar result from their agrarian policy. It has turned out, however, that the Russian peasant, having actually seized the land on his own account, never dreamt of defending either Russia or the Revolution which made it possible for him to obtain the land. As soon as he found himself in firm possession he became the doourest of creatures and abandoned the Revolution to its enemies, the State to disintegration, and the urban population to hunger.

To be continued.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT BOOK SERVICE.

152, FLEET STREET

(ENTRANCE, FIRST DOOR ON LEFT IN BOLT COURT FROM FLEET STREET.)

WE CAN SUPPLY!

Books on History, Economics, etc.

Cloth Covers.	
Woman and Labour (Olive Schreiner).....	4/6
Social Theory (G. D. H. Cole).....	4/6
Capital To-day (Cahen).....	10/-
Government and People (Conrad Gill).....	7/6
A.B.C. of Communism (Bukharin).....	3/6
The Inequality of Incomes in Modern Communities (Hugh Dalton, M.A.).....	10/6
Origin of Poverty, and Formation of the Village Community (J. St. Levinski, D.Ec.Sc., Brussels).....	3/6
The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain in the 19th Century (L. C. A. Knowles, Litt.D.).....	432 pp. 6/6
Creative Revolution (C. & E. Paul).....	8/6
Justice and Liberty (G. Louise Dickinson).....	3/-
The Next War (Will Irwin).....	7/6
Radiant Motherhood (Marie Stopes).....	6/-
Married Love (Marie Stopes).....	6/-
Wise Parenthood (Marie Stopes).....	3/6
Poverty of Philosophy (Marx).....	7/-
Science and Revolution (Untermann).....	3/6
The World's Revolutions (Untermann).....	3/6
Marxian Economics (Untermann).....	6/6
Anarchism and Socialism (Fuchanoff).....	3/6
Memoirs of Marx (Wilhelm Liebknecht).....	3/6
Feuerbach (Engels).....	3/6
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism (Engels).....	6/6
Origin of the Family (Engels).....	3/6
Philosophical Essays (Dietzgen).....	7/6
Positive Outcome of Philosophy (Dietzgen).....	7/6
Ethics and Materialistic Conception of History (Kautsky).....	3/6
The Instinct of Workmanship (Thorstein Veblen). Traced from its purity in the savage, to its contaminated state in the present-day machine-man.....	12/6
The Engineers and the Paice System (Thorstein Veblen).....	7/6

YOU

NEED A

UNION SELF-FILLING FOUNTAIN PEN

Complete with clip. Always ready for use. Does not leak.

Do not miss this opportunity. Send a postal order for 1/1 to-day to the Workers' Dreadnought, and you will receive the pen by return of post.

Profits to the Dreadnought £500 Fund.

LEONARD'S ACADEMY.

698 HIGH ROAD, LEXTONSTONE.

Sunday, May 21st, 7.30 p.m.

Discussion on "Communism and the Unemployed." Opened by Sylvia Pankhurst.

TEA. LITERATURE.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

HAND-MADE STRAW HATS, 10/- each, in all colours, plain and variegated, to harmonise with your own material. Profits to the Workers' Dreadnought £500 Fund. Apply: Box 1 D, Workers' Dreadnought Office.

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