

The Politics of "Searchlight."

Workers' Dreadnought

Founded and Edited by SYLVIA PANKHURST.

VOL. IX. No. 46

SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1923.

Weekly—PRICE ONE PENNY.

LEWIS, HULL, AND LONG.
By P. R. Roux.

The martyrs three on gallows swing,
And with their dying breath they sing
The hymn that now in every land
Unites the workers hand to hand
Across the waters blue and wide,
To sweep the tyrants all aside.
Your names will live in many a song,
Brave Lewis, Hull, and fearless Long.

The hangman's rope your voices stilled,
But thrice ten million hearts were thrilled
By soul so staunch and deed so high,
For worthy cause to fight and die.
Then let the tale be often told,
How sleep the three in scarlet fold
Of flag they loved so true and strong,
Brave Lewis, Hull, and fearless Long.

O masters foul the time is near,
When you will quake with sudden fear.
The ruddy dawn is close at hand,
When vengeance will affright the land.
The awful carnage will be just
For age-long greed and rapine lust.
So keep alive in speech and song
Brave Lewis, Hull, and fearless Long.

From pole to pole the people's flag
Will float o'er ocean, plain and crag.
A cultured people then will wield
Dominion over air and field.
No lock nor key will then be found,
For wealth and plenty will abound.
So sleep in peace, you were not wrong,
Brave Lewis, Hull, and fearless Long.

When organised in industry,
No nations armed in rivalry,
The earth to all a common soil.
Then need we work but never toil,
For pleasure then we do our best,
At play, at work, and with a zest,
No need for hooter nor a gong,
Brave Lewis, Hull, and fearless Long.

Johannesburg,
South Africa.

Voting for the right is doing nothing for it.
It is only expressing to men feebly your desire
that it should prevail.—H. D. Thoreau, Civil
Disobedience.

"Anyone who has more than enough to
live on is a monster—a human cancer preying
upon the lives of the rest of humanity."—
Romain Rolland, "John Christopher."

A THEATRE CRECHE.

Capitalism occasionally does for profit what
Socialism would do for use. The Balham
Hippodrome has opened a creche, where
mothers may leave their children under the
care of a trained nurse during the perform-
ance. Since it is Capitalism, not Com-
munism, that runs the creche, and since we
are living in a dirty disease-ridden Capitalist
world, the theatre creche may prove, we fear,
a source of infection.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

A blue mark in this space
indicates that your subscrip-
tion is now due.

The high cost of production
of the paper necessitates prompt payment

Plotting About the Ruhr.

THE POLICY FOR COMMUNISTS.
COMMUNISM v. ANOTHER BALANCE OF POWER.

MACDONALD PROPOSES A GERMAN-BRITISH COMBINATION.

The attitude of the British Press towards the French occupation of the Ruhr is changing daily. Lord Northcliffe was always pro-French on this question, and Lord Rothermere adopts the same attitude. Now the "Daily Telegraph," which has taken up a more or less anti-French position on the question, a position which is daily weakening, has announced its refusal to publish an article against the French policy by Mr. Lloyd George, and has been thanked for the refusal by French newspapers.

The French intend a permanent occupation and eventual annexation of the Ruhr for the sake of its coal and iron resources, which they intend to unite to those of Lorraine. Certain British Capitalist interests fear the competition of such a great coal and iron district in the hands of French Capitalism; but Lord Rothermere urges that British Capitalism should assist the French in the enterprise, and claim a share in the spoils.

Mussolini, the brigand dictator of Italy, has been negotiating for an Italian share: if Italy can be sure of a share he is willing either to enter a Franco-British combination or a Franco-German combination, with Britain shut out in the cold.

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, the Labour Party leader, instead of standing aloof from this dirty business and working for the international solidarity of the proletariat and the replacing of Capitalism by Socialism, which is the only alternative to another great Capitalist war, is actually proposing that the British Government should enter an economic combination with the German Government.

An economic combination means a military combination when war comes, as it certainly will, on economic grounds. No Socialist can support any economic, political, or military combination between Capitalist Powers.

It is, moreover, highly grotesque for those who profess to believe in the League of Nations to support such sectional groupings of the nations, which, of course, reduce any general League to a mere farce.

We ourselves are opposed to the League of Nations. We realise that, given the existence of Capitalism, a combination of Capitalist Governments is a barrier against the workers' revolution and a menace to the country which attempts to establish Communism. Nevertheless, Mr. Macdonald, in his demand for a British-German economic combination against France, is inconsistent and out of harmony even with the reformist policy of dependence on Capitalism of the Second International.

Mr. Macdonald, like Mr. Branting and other leaders of the Labour Party and Second International, is also calling for the Ruhr question to be submitted to the League of Nations or the Hague Tribunal.

Such demands are an indication that when we same persons and their co-workers discuss action against the French invasion by the International Federation of Trade Unions they only mean meetings and resolutions.

The "Manchester Guardian" is calling on Mr. Bonar Law to declare the policy of his Government in regard to the Ruhr. His

policy is described so far as "benevolent neutrality." It is certainly benevolent, for whilst the British military police in Germany are said to take no part in the arrest and deportation of Germans who have resisted the French, yet the British military police are "protecting" the French military police in carrying out these arrests and deportations.

The British Government has announced that Mr. Bonar Law is consulting the Law officers of the British Crown in regard to the legality of the French action in the Ruhr.

Certainly the German workers can have no enthusiasm in working for the great industrial Capitalist groups of the Ruhr, which, above all since the war, have become the masters of Germany: Stinnes, Krupp, the Phoenix, the A.E.G., Mannesmann, Hoesch, Haniel and Stumm. These precious patriots have only just distinguished themselves by evading taxation through a gamble in exchange values. When the tax was put on they asked the Government to give them time to pay, as business was bad. The French occupation, of course, sent the mark hurtling down, and thus all but wiped out the actual value of the tax.

The French are preparing to meet refusals to work for them by cutting off the Ruhr from the unoccupied part of Germany, in order to starve the workers into acquiescence. They boast that they can keep up the penalty of attrition longer than the people of the Ruhr can endure it.

If the industrial resistance against the French armies is really tried out in Germany the world will witness a trial of strength which will teach many lessons to those who contemplate the industrial resistance of the workers to a native Capitalist Government. A general strike against France in the Ruhr will have many features in common with a general strike against Whitehall and its Capitalist backers in Britain.

If the German workers rise against French militarism, may they rise for Communism and the Soviets in Germany.

The struggle going forward in Germany is testing the professions of international solidarity of all the workers' Parties.

The Moscow Executive of the Third International has now called for a general strike in Austria, France, Holland, and England on January 31st. No preparation for such a move has been made here, nor apparently in France.

This may be a polite hint that British neutrality will cease unless the British Government's wishes are respected.

That France intends permanently to detach the Rhineland and the Ruhr from Germany, and place the whole area under her own control, is common knowledge, the Belgian industrialists being co-operators in the scheme. The report on the Ruhr prepared for M. Poincaré by M. Dariac, who was sent there as a Commissioner of the French Government, reveals this clearly, as the following extracts show:

"The Ruhr . . . constitutes the principal element of German wealth, which is

FROM BULGARIA.

D. Entleff, of the Bulgarian Communist Party, writes:

"We read the 'Workers' Dreadnought' with interest. We translate many articles from it for our weekly paper, 'The Workers' Spark.' We hope that our forthcoming Conference at Varna will strengthen our Bulgarian movement and assist us in our international relations."

based entirely on iron and coal, their transformations and their derivatives. . . .

"Of the 191,000,000 tons of coal which Germany produced in 1913, 115,000 came from the Ruhr. . . .

"Before the war the German production of cast iron amounted to 19,000,000 tons, of which 9,000,000 tons were produced by the Ruhr blast-furnaces; the loss of Lorraine and Upper Silesia have reduced the possible production to 11,000,000 tons.

"No doubt we do not hold the whole of the Ruhr, but by our simple occupation at present we hold in reality the whole of its industrial production under our domination. . . . [This was written before the present extended invasion.]

"So long as we maintain our present position on the Rhine we shall thus constitute a constant menace for the ten or twelve masters of German industry who are in reality financially the master of Germany. . . .

"We cannot dream of abandoning this pledge. . . .

"Is it not possible to imagine the utilisation of the Ruhr by a collaboration, a friendly entente between France and the Allies on the one part, and Germany on the other, with permanent control of its means of production? . . .

"We cannot demand that Germany shall pay enormous sums for 35 years, and on the other hand we are afraid of seeing her industries develop in the proportion which would permit her to assure the payment of the debts which she has acknowledged. But so long as we are on the right bank of the Rhine and are masters of 45 million tons a year of ore, we shall be in a position to play a decisive part in the German metal industry, demanding a control of production in return.

"And no doubt this will be the solution of the future. So long as the Committee of Guarantees limits itself to controlling the German finances it will do no more than periodically report a series of monetary disasters which it will be impotent to alter. The day when it has the power to control Germany's industrial production we shall be in a position to profit by her economic prosperity. . . .

"The whole of French policy in the Rhineland is at all times subordinate to one primary condition, the prolonged maintenance of our army of the Rhine in the occupied territories. Without this assurance this policy is disastrously precarious. . . .

"In the life of a nation five, ten, or fifteen years count for little. If we had to withdraw at the end of these short periods our role must be limited to an occupation by way of military guarantee. Must we, on the contrary, remain? . . .

"The judicial thesis of the foreclosure, the right of the unpaid creditor to enter upon the property which he holds from his debtor as guarantee, was applicable here. . . . France thus disengaged, the policy of autonomy which should be ours, and which, after this gesture, became relatively easy, whereas until then it had been impossible.

"The first act of this policy is the financial organisation of the Rhineland: a Customs barrier placed on the east facing Germany and razed on the west facing France, to avoid the economic strangulation which would result from a double fiscal wall diminishing the exchange of goods and com-

This is the only anti-Parliamentary weekly paper for Communism in Britain.

This is the only weekly paper advocating pure, free Communism.

This is the only weekly paper working for an industrial instead of a mere Parliamentary organisation for securing Communism.

It is a literary paper; it is a well-informed paper.

Party or no party: do you wish to spread these ideas?

It is the idea that counts.

Are you doing all you can to help this paper?

TAKE A COPY WITH YOU TO THE WORKSHOP.

promising the industrial life of the Rhineland; a budget separate from that of the Reich; the substitution of a healthy currency for the damaged mark.

"The second act is the replacement of Prussian by Rhenish functionaries.

"The third is the extension of the powers of the High Commissioner and the convocation of an elected assembly.

"These are doubtless ambitious projects, but if executed wisely and discerningly in proportion as Germany slips out of her engagements they would be amply justified. It is a long-drawn-out policy, in which a well-considered diplomacy must apply one after another the successive links of a well-thought-out course of action which, little by little, will detach from Germany a free Rhineland under the military guard of France and Belgium."

It will be observed that M. Dariae speaks of the friendly collaboration of the Allies in this scheme of annexation. Nevertheless, the traditional British lion may not be wholly pleased by the prospect; for if war came between France and Britain the vast coal and iron basin at the junction of France and Germany would most likely fall into the hands of France, and thus give her a tremendous advantage in producing the munitions of war. If Germany were the Ally of Britain, Germany might retake the coal and iron basin, and so crush France between the murderous hail emanating from two great munition centres. This thought is agitating the minds of many of those super-patriots who lately were so violent in their anti-German sentiments.

Nevertheless, the fact that Britain, with the support of France and Italy, has offered to refer the Mosul oil question to the League of Nations, proves that there is not yet a breach with France.

As to the German Capitalists, who have built up huge fortunes out of Germany's misery, their only means of resisting the French appears to lie in a general strike (either open or concealed under the cloak of 'cannny' on the part of the workers. There appears to be much hesitating and difference of opinion in regard to this course. Reports that the leaders of this group of workers and that have come to terms with the French succeed each other, and there are numerous reports that strikes have begun and have come to an end.

COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANISM.

By Bishop Brown.

Bishop Brown has made a clean break with theological philosophy and mysticism and placed himself on the sound and solid foundation of Darwinism in biology and Marxism in economics. He makes neither apology nor excuse for his position.—The Weekly People.

I had concluded from the title-page that it was one of those "Dry as Dust" economic works that I could "read" in five minutes; but I was mistaken. I got through sixty pages before I realised more fuel was required in the stove, so I went to bed, tucked myself in comfortably, switched on the reading lamp, and read the whole 224 pages through. I could not leave the book. It held me tight.—The Spokane Forum.

This is a lucid, penetrating, and at times startling book.

From the "Dreadnought" Bookshop, 1/- Post free, 1/2. Send for it at once.

DEAD LEAVES.

By Paul Eldridge.

The old woman lay outstretched in the unpolished coffin. She seemed straight now, and tall, although, when alive two days ago, she was tiny and bent, her head always scanning the earth, disproving thus man's majesty, that he alone of all animals looks directly into God's million eyes, the stars. Her face showed unpleasantly the contour of her skull; indeed, it was already a skeleton, but covered with a thin yellow leather, so as not to hurt the sight of the living, and there was nothing about her toothless lips to indicate that divine smile generally accorded to the dead.

The room was still very neat. The old woman had always been a fine housekeeper. She would raise her bony, bent body as some thin dog that stands on his hind legs, and would clean every speck upon the walls and the humble furniture. When she lay dying on her bed, her eyes, which were sharp and far-sighted, noticed some unclean spot upon the ceiling. She raised her hand feebly, and made a motion as though cleaning the place; her old husband and an aged neighbour who were there whispered to each other that she probably saw the Angel of Death coming down upon her, and that she was trying to drive him off. It was then that they knew in all certainty that she was dying. Now her poor closed eyes rested for ever from the annoyance of this muddy planet, and a few flies felt at liberty to buzz undaunted about the room, even at times touching their dead enemy's eyelids or sharp, almost needle-like nose.

Within an hour or two the undertaker was to come and remove the corpse. Meanwhile two old women, next-door neighbours, were sitting at the window, whispering to each other.

"Yes, she was a good soul, and cleaner than any old woman I've ever known."

"I remember when I was sick last year, she kept her own house and mine, and never seemed tired out."

"She had a wonderful constitution. You know, I thought many times: 'This crippled little body will outlive another generation of strong people.' And, now, here she is dead." And she sighed that long sigh which fills the lungs to the apex, and cheers one.

"I should not be surprised to see her get off and begin to clean around."

The husband of the deceased sat in a dark corner of the room, a yellow-faced man, bald to the neck, and shaking incessantly his head, as if to say to all things, "No, no." His eyes were widely open, but he saw nothing at all. Of all the seventy-five years that he had lived, it seemed nothing had remained. A mocking wind had blown away the debris of memory immaculate, as mocking autumn winds whirl around the dried, twisted leaves of withering trees, and whistle them far off, leaving the ground spotless.

For more than half a century that little body in the coffin had been his faithful wife; for more than half a century they had loved each other, first passionately, then, as the years passed on, quietly, like brother and sister. It was a fire that first burst in long tongues of flame, then gradually subsided and covered itself with a hillock of ashes, but never died out, and always kept warm. They

(Continued on p. 3.)

THE REIGN OF PLENTY.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Continued from last week.)

The characters of the new conditions are plain, and their consequences are easy to understand. As the manufacturing nations of West Europe are meeting with steadily growing difficulties in selling their manufactured goods abroad, and getting food in exchange, they will be compelled to grow their food at home; they will be bound to rely on home customers for their manufactures, and on home producers for their food. And the sooner they do so the better. The necessity of the new adaptation is already felt badly enough, but it would have been felt still worse were it not for the relief which came unexpectedly from the prairies of America, India, and Russia, which were brought within an easy reach from the West European cities by a sudden extension of the railway nets. Were it not for that relief, the pinch of the present industrial crisis would have been felt still more severely. We see, indeed, that even now, notwithstanding the suddenly increased facilities for imports and an almost unprecedented cheapness of the chief articles of food, the United Kingdom has been compelled during the last two years considerably to reduce its consumption of wheat, rice, potatoes, bacon, butter, and so on.* But the relief which came from America and India, and which permitted us to have cheaper food precisely when the exports realised the lowest prices, was but temporary; it cannot last, as will be seen further on.

And, like all temporary reliefs, it brought about a new set of disturbances which accelerated and enforced the action of general causes; it made European agriculture suffer and deprive the European manufacturers of millions of home customers. It aggravated the industrial crisis. So that a fact which, at first sight, seemed to tell in favour of imported food, becomes an argument in the other direction.

Two great objections stand, however, in the way against the general acceptance of the above conclusions. We have been taught, both by economists and politicians, that the territories of the West European States are so overcrowded with inhabitants that they cannot grow all the food and raw produce which are necessary for the maintenance of their steadily increasing populations. Therefore, the necessity of exporting manufactured ware, and of importing food. And we are told, moreover, that even if it were possible to grow in Western Europe all the food necessary for the inhabitants, there would be no advantage in doing so, as long as the same food can be had cheaper from abroad. Such are the present teachings and the ideas which are current in society at large. And yet it is easy to prove that both are totally erroneous: the territories of Western Europe could grow plenty of food for much more than their present populations, and an immense benefit would be derived from doing precisely so. These are the two points which I have now to discuss, so far as it is possible in the narrow limits of a review article.

To begin by taking the most disadvantageous case: is it possible that the soil of the United Kingdom, which at present yields food for one-half only of its inhabitants, could provide all the necessary amount and variety of food for 35,000,000 human beings when it covers only 78,000,000 acres, all told—forests and rocks, marshes and peat-bogs, cities, railways, and fields? The current opinion is that it by no means can; and that opinion is so inveterate that we even see a scientist like Mr. Huxley, who is always so cautious when dealing with current opinion in science, endorse that opinion without even taking the trouble of verifying it. It is accepted as an axiom. And yet, as soon as we try to find out any argument in its favour, we discover that it has not the slightest foundation, either in facts, or in judgment upon well-known facts.

Let us take, for instance, J. B. Lawes's estimates of crops which are published every year in the "Times." In his last estimate, of October 17th, 1887, we may read that during the eight harvest years 1853-1860, nearly three-fourths of the aggregate amount of wheat consumed in the United Kingdom was of home growth, and little more than one-fourth was derived from foreign sources; but at present the figures are almost reversed—that is, during the eight years 1879-1886, little more than one-third has been provided by home crops and nearly two-thirds by imports. But neither the increase of population by 8,000,000, nor the increase of consumption of wheat (by six-tenths of a bushel per head) account for the change. Thirty years ago the soil of Britain nourished one inhabitant on every two acres cultivated; why does it now require three acres in order to nourish the same inhabitant? The answer is plain: merely and simply because agriculture has fallen into neglect during the last thirty years. In fact, the area under wheat has been reduced since 1853-60 by full 1,500,000 acres, and therefore the average crop of the last four years was below the average crop of 1853-60 by more than 40,000,000 bushels; and this deficit alone represents the food of more than seven million inhabitants. At the same time, the area under barley, oats, beans, and other spring crops has also been reduced by further 500,000 acres, which at the low average of thirty bushels per acre would represent the cereals necessary to complete the above for the same 7,000,000 inhabitants. And so we can say that if the United Kingdom imports cereals for 17,000,000 inhabitants instead of 10,000,000, it is simply because more than 2,000,000 acres have gone out of cultivation.** But the same decrease is seen under the heads of green crops and the like. The area under potatoes has been reduced by 280,000 acres; under turnips by 180,000 acres; and although there is an increase under the heads of mangolds, carrots, etc., still the aggregate area under all these crops has been reduced by a further 330,000 acres, and under flax by 140,000 acres. An increase of area is found only for permanent pasture (2,800,000 acres) and grass under rotation (1,600,000 acres); but we should look in vain for a corresponding increase of live-stock.†

In short, it is not the increase of population nor its increased consumption which has upset the relative importance of home-grown and imported wheat and cereals altogether. It is chiefly the desertion, the abandonment of agriculture. Each crop requiring human labour has had its area reduced; and one-third of the agricultural labourers have been sent away since 1861 to reinforce the ranks of the unemployed in the cities;‡ so that, far from being over-populated, the fields of Britain are starved of human labour, as James Caird used to say. The British nation does not work on her soil; she is prevented from doing so; and the would-be economists complain that the soil will not nourish its inhabitants. "Tel seigneur, telle terre," would be the answer of the French peasants.

(To be continued.)

* By from 12 to 20 per cent., as compared with the year 1880. See J. B. Lawes "The Wheat Crop of 1887"; in the "Times," October 17th, 1887; also the Financial Reform Almanack for 1888, p. 9.

** Average area under wheat in 1853-60, 4,092,160 acres; average crop, 14,310,779 quarters. Average area under crop in 1884-87, 2,509,055 acres; average crop (good years), 9,198,956 quarters. See Professor W. Fream's Rothamstead Experiments (London, 1888), p. 83. I take, in the above, Sir John Lawes' figure of 5.65 bushels per head of population every year. It is very close to the yearly allowance of 5.67 bushels of the French statisticians. The Russian statisticians reckon 5.67 bushels of winter crops (chiefly rye) and 2.5 bushels of spring crops (sarrazin, barley, etc.).

† There is an increase of 1,800,000 head of horned cattle, and a decrease of 4½ million sheep (6 2-3 millions, if we compare the year

(Dead Leaves, continued from p. 2.)

had a little son, who died many years ago; they had friends, who were all buried; they had money, which was lost; they had laughter and tears and hopes and disillusion—but all these things, this kaleidoscope of life had been washed off the screen, and the screen crumpled up and thrown away. . . . And the old man sat huddled up in the large chair, the straw of which was coming out of its heavy belly, and saw nothing, knew nothing of seventy-five years.

"I don't know why people want to live many years," whispered one of the old women to the other.

"I suppose it's because they've never known what it is to be old. Now, what do you think her old man will do without her?"

"She was a wonderful wife to him."

"He was never so easy to get along with—very irritable."

"I suppose he'll be taken care of by the charities."

"The charities!" exclaimed the other, and laughed like the nerve-racking tearing of fuzzy cloth, showing two long yellow teeth, one in either jaw. "Don't you know what the charities are?"

"I don't think he has any relatives. I never saw any come up."

"No; it was rather a mysterious couple—never talked of themselves."

"Who knows what their life has been?"

Then each woman's mind painted on a swiftly turning canvas a life for the silent corpse and her silent husband. These were, in general, unpleasant lives, suspicious, vulgar, obscene, crowded with pain and disillusion—lives that old, disappointed women like old, disappointed gods could create.

"You can never tell who people are."

"Yes, it's true—you can't."

"When is the undertaker supposed to come?"

"Should be here by this time."

"I am getting chilled. I should like to go in and make me a cup of warm coffee."

"I guess we better wait, anyhow. He seems all upset to-day."

Then there was silence again. The old woman lay eternally still in her coffin; her old husband, weary, fell asleep in the large chair, whose straw was dropping slowly; the flies buzzed dreamily about the corpse; the old women were looking out of the window and thinking of their kitchens, of warm clothes, of coffee, of dead old women and poor old men.

The undertaker came, the coffin was sealed and carried out. The old women followed, shedding a few cold tears. The door was closed with a bang. The old man, deep in his chair, was forgotten. He was not supposed to follow the hearse, any way. He had heard no noise, and was sleeping on. Then he awoke and looked about him. It seemed to him that something strange had taken place; he tried to recollect for a few minutes, but the canvas of life was being incessantly washed clean of all pictures. He rose, walked to the cupboard, took some coffee that his wife had made, for she made coffee for a week at a time, warmed it, and drank, while his little head, bald to the neck, shook and shook, saying to all things—"No, no."

The wind, the master piper, whistled his eternal tedium through the chimney.

1886 with 1863), which would correspond to an increase of 1½ million of units of cattle, because eight sheep are reckoned as equivalent to one head of horned cattle. But five million acres having been re-claimed upon waste land since 1860, the above increase should hardly do for covering that area, so that the 2½ million acres which are cultivated no longer remain fully uncovered. They are a pure loss to the nation.

‡ Agricultural labourers: 2,100,000 in 1861; 1,883,000 in 1884.

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.

SUBSCRIPTIONS.
Three Months (13 weeks) ... Post Free 1/7½
Six Months (26 weeks) ... " " 3/3
One Year (52 weeks) ... " " 6/6

Vol. IX. No. 46 Saturday, Jan. 27, 1923.

OUR VIEW.

WHILST THE GRIM STRUGGLE is going on in the Ruhr, the executive of the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam is supposed to be discussing "the possibility of taking definite action in protest" against the French measures in the Ruhr. The Amsterdam International has approved an appeal to the workers to be ready for action, and a warning against "thoughtless and unpremeditated action." In short, the Amsterdam International is telling the workers to wait till it tells them to act, and eventually it will tell them to pass some resolutions.

Meanwhile, the Capitalist reaction will have done its worst.

If the Amsterdam International were an International of action and genuine in its opposition to the French Government's measures in the Ruhr, it would stop the handling of Ruhr coal by French and Belgian workers. It would also stop the supply of British coal to France. If such measures were insufficient it would take others.

But if the Amsterdam International were a Socialist International, and an International of action, it would bring the Capitalist system to an end.

THE REWARD OF GENIUS under Capitalism is frequently penny. The Reward Romney, though one of the more fortunate of the geniuses, was only paid 18 guineas for the portrait of Lady Emily Kerr when he painted it in 1779-80. In 1905 it was sold at Christie's for 2,600 guineas. No artist can make from his art the vast sums which the traders and speculators amass by exploiting the labour and the follies of others.

THE PRINCES IS TO BE SOLD, and the "Star" suggests that it should be used as a permanent home for musical comedy.

The real need, however, is for a Red Playhouse which would provide a field in which the Red playwrights, players, and artists might give free expression to their ideas, and through which they might do more for the advancement of popular opinion than all the election speeches ever made.

This is a proposition which should interest Bernard Shaw, Miles Malleson, and a host of others, some of whom are not without influence in the circles through which the needful funds could be raised if the requisite energy were forthcoming.

A Red Playhouse should devote itself to the production of existing Red dramas. Its very existence would stimulate the writing of others, towards which it should extend a cordial encouragement.

WE STATED in a recent issue that an Italian Member of Parliament of the Social Democratic Right Wing had offered to write some articles on the Fascists for the "Daily Herald," because the "Daily Herald" editor had shown

such conspicuous ignorance regarding the Fascists. Our readers will remember Mr. Hamilton Fyfe's words:

"Whether the Italian Fascists are enemies to the point of view of the workers in this country is not very clear. . . . It is impossible not to feel a certain amount of admiration for this man who has organised what he calls a bloodless revolution." Such statements as this have been greatly resented in the Italian movement.

We have now received the following communication from the "Daily Herald":

"I think you will be glad to know that the statements somebody has made to you about the rejection by the "Daily Herald" of certain articles on the Fascists are, as a matter of fact, entirely false. The matter was in my hands, so I can myself tell you the facts.

The gentleman in question offered to do us an article on Fascismo, and was asked to do one of about 500 words on the probable developments of Fascismo now that Mussolini had become Premier and, virtually, dictator of Italy. What he did in point of fact produce was two articles, one of 1,200 words, one of 1,250 words (I have them in front of me at the moment). Neither of them was on the subject proposed. The first was on the genesis of Fascismo, the second an analysis of Fascist psychology.

You know yourself the conditions of space under which we work, and will readily realise the absolute impossibility of running a whole series of articles of this length. Apart from that, their actual quality was not specially high.

There was never the slightest suggestion from anybody in this office that they were "too strong in their attack."

"Would it not be possible, before making an accusation of this kind, for you to call us up on the telephone, so that at any rate you would know our side of the question?"

However, in this case it is not a matter of one or the other side of a question: it is merely that, not to put a fine point upon it, your informant has been lying.

Yours sincerely,
W. N. EWER."

Our reply to the above letter is that our informant was **not lying**, though it is possible that the "Herald" editorial department and the Italian Socialist Member of Parliament did not quite understand each other. The Italian Member of Parliament had no intention of playing the part of prophet: he was appalled by the "Herald's" gross misrepresentations of the Fascist movement. It was precisely upon the genesis and psychology of the Fascist movement that he desired and offered to write.

Mr. Ewer says that the articles submitted were too long. That is the common failing with which every editor has to contend; but the competent editor knows how to apply the blue pencil. Five hundred words, however, was really too short a space in which to remove the erroneous views expressed in the "Herald"; and, to give an adequate explanation of the movement, Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, in an article in the "Herald," wrote 1,000 words. Surely the Italian Member of Parliament might have been allowed the same amount of space in two days' issues, in order that he might have the opportunity of refuting that article and several others. The "Herald's" editors could doubtless have brought the communications within that compass.

Mr. Ewer further says that the quality of the articles was "not specially high." Probably not; the Italian Member of Parliament was writing in what was a foreign language to him. Perhaps he has not had Mr. Hamilton Fyfe's wide journalistic experience, though it is doubtful whether amongst his native poets he could have made so great a blunder as Hamilton Fyfe when he attributed a Tennyson quotation to Browning.

The point is, however, that the communications of the Italian Member of Parliament were written by one who had, unlike Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, a familiar knowledge of the matter in hand. The fact that the writer belonged to the moderate wing of the Italian movement was calculated to appeal to the most moderate of the "Herald" readers.

We think the rejection of the articles both a mistake in policy and a breach of the courtesy due to guests from the movement in another country, where the comrades have been called to suffer violence on account of their faith.

We advise the "Daily Herald" to reconsider its decision to reject the articles.

JAURES was murdered when the war of 1914 broke out. Now that the French have invaded the Ruhr it is one of the other side whose life has been taken.

When she shot Marius Plateau, an editor of the militarist "Action Francaise" and a leader of the reactionary Camelots du Roi, Germaine Berton thought of the millions of lives that were sacrificed through the policies of such men in the late war, and the lives that will be sacrificed through the present policies of such men in the Ruhr. She will be condemned by those who have neither her courage, nor the capacity she has shown to make the greatest possible sacrifice in the people's cause.

Let there be no mistake—such a deed, under such circumstances, is a supreme sacrifice, possible only to one who is spurred on by profoundest zeal and conviction. The might of Capitalist Society is upraised to destroy Germaine Berton for her defiant deed, but she has struck her blow; she measured its consequences before she struck.

Others may discuss whether her blow is effective, "whether that sort of thing does any good"; but she who awaits the penalty of her action is at least able to say: "I did not share the responsibility of evil by slothful and cowardly acquiescence. I have done what I could."

Who that has called the soldier a hero shall dare to condemn her?

THE BUILDERS have lost in wages 29/4 per man per week since May 1921. The 20 per cent. reduction now demanded by the employers will bring the wages down to £2 19s. 3d. for skilled men, and £2 4s. for labourers, and these figures apply to the higher-paid grades. At the same time the employers are asking for an increase in the working hours. The builders talk of resisting, but we do not expect them to succeed unless they are prepared to put up a real fight, and a strong fight; and we do not think they will do so yet.

THE AVERAGE WAGE of the agricultural labourer is now down to 25/- a week—14/0/- at pre-war standards—though he has a Union now. What a piteous end to all the high hopes of betterment held out to these poor workers! Let it not be the end; the farmers are talking of reducing the wage to 18/-, which is 10/1/- at pre-war values. And yet we have a great Trade Union movement—the greatest the world has ever seen; and this is the hub of the greatest Empire which has been victorious in the greatest war.

DREADNOUGHT £500 FUND.
Brought forward, £430 18s. 8d.
Per S. Cahill, 2/6; per Mrs. Cole, 3/-;
A. W. Smith, 7d.; A. B. Howie, 2/-; High-
bury Corner Collection, 1/10; Debate, Caledo-
nian Club, Collection, £1 9s. 7d.; Special
Fund: Mrs. Dawson Clark, 5/-; L. Gallag-
her, 10/-; Per A. R. Nottley, 10/-; Mrs.
Hulley Rawlins, £1; S. Hickton, 5/-;
D. Scourfield, £1; D. Jewson, 10/4;
W. Pentney, 10/-; Per A. Guaducci, £1 12s.
Total for week, £8 7s. 10d. Total, £430 18s. 6d.

ONE MORE SUBSCRIBER FROM YOU THIS WEEK.

COMMUNISM AND ITS TACTICS.

Under Communism all shall satisfy their material needs without stint or measure, from the common storehouse, according to their desires. Everyone will be able to have what he or she desires in food, in clothing, books, music, education and travel facilities. The abundant production now possible, and which invention will constantly facilitate, will remove any need for rationing or limiting of consumption.

Every individual, relying on the great common production, will be secure from material want and anxiety.

There will be no class distinctions. These arise from differences in material possessions, education, and social status. All such differences will be swept away.

There will be neither rich nor poor. Money will no longer exist, and none will desire to hoard commodities not in use, since a fresh supply may be obtained at will. There will be no selling, because there will be no buyers, since everyone will be able to obtain everything desired without payment.

The possession of private property, beyond that which is in actual personal use, will disappear.

There will be neither masters nor servants. Because all will be economically equal—no individual will be able to become the employer of another.

Children will be educated up to adult age, and adults will be able to make free, un-stinted use of all educational facilities in their abundant leisure.

Stealing, forgery, burglary, and all economic crimes will disappear, with the vast and objectionable apparatus which at present exists for preventing, detecting, and punishing crime.

Prostitution will become extinct; it is a commercial transaction, dependent upon the economic need of the prostitute and the customer's power to pay.

Sexual union will no longer be based upon material conditions, but will be freely contracted on the basis of affection and mutual attraction. The marriage laws, having become obsolete, will disappear. If people have ceased to be happy together they will part in freedom and without incurring the stigma of social disapproval.

The birth of children will cease to be prevented by reason of poverty. Material anxiety being removed, and the race for wealth eliminated, other objects and ambitions will take the place of the individual struggle for existence and material wealth. Since all will benefit from the labour of all, praise will be given, not to the wealthy, as at present, but to those who prove skilful and zealous in the common service.

Emulation in work will take the place of emulation in wealth.

With the disappearance of the anxious struggle for existence, which saps the energy and cripples initiative, a new vigour, a new independence will develop. People will have more courage to desire freedom, greater determination to possess it. They will be more exacting as to their choice of a vocation. They will wish to work at what they enjoy, to order their lives as they desire. Work will be generally enjoyed as never before in the history of mankind.

The desire for freedom will be tempered by the sense of responsibility towards the commonweal, which will provide security for all.

Public opinion provides a stronger, more general compulsion than any penal code, and public opinion will strongly disapprove idleness and waste.

To secure the abundant production necessary to Communism, and to cope with the ever-growing complexity of modern life and requirements, large-scale production and co-operative effort is necessary. The people of today would not be willing to go back to producing everything by hand in domestic workshops; were they to do so, they could not maintain the population in comfort and

with reasonable leisure. The people of to-day would be unwilling to abandon all the productive factories, the trains, the electric generating stations, and so on. The retention of such things necessitates the working together of large numbers of people. As soon as numbers of people are working together and supplying with their products numbers of other people, some sort of organisation of work and of distribution becomes inevitable. The work itself cannot be carried on without organisation. In each industry, either the workers concerned in the work must form and control the organisation, or they will be under the dominion of the organisers. The various industries are interlocked in interest and utility; therefore the industrial organisations must be interlocked.

When wages have disappeared, when all are upon a basis of economic equality; when to be manager, director, organiser, brings no material advantage, the desire to occupy such positions will be less widespread and less keen, and the danger of oppressive action by the management will be largely nullified. Nevertheless, management imposed on unwilling subordinates will not be tolerated; where the organiser has chosen the assistants, the assistants will be free to leave; where the assistants choose the organiser, they will be free to change him. Co-operation for the common good is necessary; but freedom, not domination, is the goal.

Since co-operative work and mutual reliance on mutual aid renders some kind of organisation necessary, the best possible form of organisation must be chosen: the test of its worth is its efficiency and the scope for freedom and initiative it allows to each of its units.

The Soviet structure of committees and delegates, built up from the base of the workshop and village assembly, presents the best form of organisation yet evolved; it arises naturally when the workers are thrown upon their own resources in the matter of government. The Soviet structure will undoubtedly be the organisational structure of Communism, at any rate, for some time to come. We live always, however, in a state of flux, and there is, and happily can be, no permanence about human institutions; there is always the possibility of something higher, as yet undiscovered.

The overthrow of Capitalism precedent to the establishment of Communism will be resisted by the possessors of wealth. Thus Capitalism will only be overthrown by revolution.

The revolution can only come when conditions are ripe for it; but opportunities may be missed: the rising may fail to take place at the opportune moment, or it may fail by mismanagement of the proletarian forces. A partial success may be achieved, and if Capitalism is not completely destroyed it may afterwards re-establish itself, as it speedily did in Hungary, as it is gradually doing in Russia.

(To be continued.)

SPICE.

"Everybody knows how great a diminution of output can be produced when staffs feel that they are being defrauded. . . . Probably the saving would amount to less than half a million a year; and to achieve this the relations between the staff and the Government would be poisoned for generations to come."—"Whitehall Court," in the "Daily Herald."

Evidently Whitehall Court belongs to the static order of thinkers who imagine that the present state of things will never change, but observe, dear reader, that only 35,000 Civil Servants work less than eight hours a day, whilst some of the remaining 250,000 and upwards work up to twelve hours a day. Trade Unionism is a narrow creed which preaches solidarity within the trade but devil take the talk outside.

Under Communism and the Soviets the people who do the job will decide how long to work.

HOW "H. B." FLOURISHED UNDER CAPITALISM.

It is stated that Horatio Bottomley, during the war, was paid by the millionaire Press £100 for a "patriotic" article every Sunday; that many of these articles were written for him by others; that he signed them and pocketed the £100 a week.

I can imagine quite a lot of supporters of the Capitalist system feeling a mild tinge of indignation on reading such statements, without in the last realising that the principle acted upon by Horatio Bottomley is the principle believed in consciously or unconsciously by all who support the present system.

Horatio Bottomley presumably paid his hacks to do the work, and he pocketed the profits. That is just what every employer sets out to do, and H. B. was no more unscrupulous in this connection than those who sell "Jones's tea, chocolate, soap, or anything else—at least, not fundamentally. Capitalism has accepted as its morality that Robinson can have cocoa manufactured and sell it with his own name attached, but Capitalism has not decreed that one man shall write an article and another claim it for his own—though I believe that many speeches which are delivered are previously written out by people other than those delivering them (including many given by Cabinet ministers).

Profits and exploitation; employer and employed. That is the crux of the matter. Those who condemn Bottomley must condemn the Capitalist system. The alternative is Communism, under which there is no exploitation. Bottomleys cannot flourish under a system which gives everyone the necessities of life in return for useful labour performed for the benefit of the community as a whole.

E. B.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

All Books Reviewed may be obtained from "Workers' Dreadnought," 152 Fleet Street, London, E. 3.

The Next Step, by Scott Nearing, published by Nellie Seeds Nearing, New York, price

The Soviet idea is permeating everywhere, and Mr. Scott Nearing has been bitten by it, like so many more. His interest in the subject seems to have been contracted via the English Guild Socialists, but he has gone further along the path than they, and does not propose the dual State Council representing man as consumer, and Guild Council representing man as producer, proposed by the National Guildsmen, as the disciple of Mr. G. D. H. Cole and his coterie have named themselves.

Mr. Nearing desires a world producers' federation, and works out a scheme for it. He has big schemes in his head, but he cannot emancipate himself yet from the idea of money and wages and buying and selling. Try again, Mr. Nearing; you may get there in time.

At the close of his book Mr. Nearing gives advice on what to read. He says that "the reformers and radicals who write of a re-made or revolutionised economic order" at the present time fall into three general groups. (1) French Syndicalists; (2) English Guild Socialists; (3) writers who describe "economic experiments that are going on in Russia and to a lesser degree elsewhere." The woful incompleteness of this classification will be apparent to our readers.

RATIONAL LIVING.

A radical, independent magazine for the workers, devoted to the teaching of rational methods of living in present society, always emphasising the social-economic-industrial background of wrong living. Stands for prevention of disease, for conservation of health, for drugless healing, and against all swindles in the healing professions. Special price for the readers of the "Workers' Dreadnought," 1.50 dol. (7/6 for 12 numbers). Our famous book, "The Child and the Home," by Dr. B. Liber, on the radical upbringing of children, special price for the readers of the "Workers' Dreadnought," 1.50 dol. (7/6). Address: Rational Living, 61 Hamilton Place, New York.

NEWS FROM IRELAND.
By Economic Section.

History is being made rapidly in Ireland just at present. The "development" of Ireland from an almost purely agricultural backward country to one of the cesspools of Big Business is proceeding at full speed.

With the old catch-cries of democratic government, "will of the people," etc., the onslaught upon the workers goes merrily. The Mason-Conservative industrial magnate clique rides rough-shod over laws, constitutions and agreements. It is backed by a Press which has nothing to learn from its British prototype when it comes to doping the workers, as witness the anti-Larkin campaign of 1913, the anti-Connolly venom of 1916. It is supported by a bureaucracy of bishops, who have consistently condemned every attempt at a step forward on the part of the Irish workers and by every reactionary in Ireland and Britain.

This, however, is so much the better, as it helps to draw the class-line sharper for some of the more backward workers, who were liable to be doped by phrases such as: "Well, it is for the good of the country, anyway."

That is what the Irish railwaymen said last January, when they were asked to be patriotic—and got the Carrigan award for their pains.

With all the modern war equipment that can be furnished by a sympathetic Imperial Government, the clique proceeds to batter out of shape the military organisation of the workers, as a preliminary to lowering the conditions of the whole working population. Money is spent like water on military operations.

The battering proceeds but slowly, however, in spite of the fact that some of the slaves of plutocracy are men who know the methods of guerilla warfare, having used them against the autocracy they now use them for, in spite of the fact that a good percentage of the Black and Tans have come back to instruct their new "comrades" in the methods of scientific torture, and in spite of the fact that the Irish Capitalist Press pours forth calumnies on the armed opponents of Big Business.

Who are the opponents of Big Business? The patriots who skulked in the Sinn Fein political organisation during the Terror? No! The weak-kneed slaves that called Connolly "Scotch Bill and Larkin Antichrist"? No! The men who fought the Black and Tans with the slogan of "God and holy Ireland" on their lips? Some of them—with a different slogan this time.

The backbone of the fight is composed of the men who have nothing to lose but their chains—and know it. All the most advanced elements among the workers of Ireland, the class-conscious men of town and country, for the most part, the men who have a principle and are prepared to back it with their lives. Those who have thrown themselves into the breach against Capitalism, against the iron heel in its worst form, are the very people whom the alleged Communist Party of Ireland set out to organise, or was supposed to organise, before that urgent business in London came along, by a strange coincidence, just at the moment when the fight began to wax warm. Agricultural workers, a goodly number of them, with a sprinkling of the proletariat from the few industrial centres, form the fighting—Economic Section.

Organised by a few wobblers, the Economic Section consists of men who are fighting the class-war pure and simple; fighting it in the Transport and other Unions, fighting it with sabotage in the shops and on the railways. Here is a free tip for fellow-worker Cosgrave. Mostly, however, we are fighting it on the bleak hillsides, gun in hand. We stand to-day where the British workers will be forced to stand in the future. We are further advanced in the struggle than the proletariat of England. The time for lip-service is past. Class-conscious workers of Britain, the phrase: "A national struggle" will serve no longer. You swear:

To bear it onward till we fall,
Come dungeons dark or gallows grim."
The Irish workers are doing it. It is up to you who call yourselves revolutionaries to see that:
"This song is not their parting hymn."
ECKSECK.

BRITISH EMPIRE UNION

A certain Trade Union leader in Liverpool has received the following letter from the British Empire Union. Observe that the B.E.U. declares itself to be "strictly non-party"; but observe also that it agitates against Communist extremists. A Communist extremist is one who desires not to patch up, but to abolish, the present system. The British Empire Union exists to preserve the present system in the interests of those who are privileged under the present system.

The B.E.U. secretary, Mr. Hughes, says the B.E.U. has a working-class membership. Here is a list of some of its members:

Lord Leith of Fyvie, owning estates at Fyvie Castle, Aberdeen, at Feners, South Devon, and at Aylesbury, Bucks.

The Duke of Northumberland, owning 169 acres of land and 244,500 acres mineral rights, which bring in £69,000 a year.

The Duke of Somerset, owning 25,400 acres of land.

The Earl of Plymouth, owning 37,500 acres in Britain, 350,000 acres in British East Africa, chairman of Barry Railway Company.

The Earl of Bradford, owning 22,000 acres.

Viscountess Churchill, whose father, the Earl of Lonsdale, owns 175,000 acres.

Lord Astor.

Earl Bathurst, who owns 12,000 acres and the "Morning Post"

The Earl of March, director of the City Equitable Fire Insurance and Commercial Bank of London.

You do not find such men working in your shop, Henry, or living in your street!

If these are workers, Henry, you will probably agree with Lord Weir that a more equal system of wages would improve your situation!

Notice, however, that the B.E.U. exists to combat anti-democratic propaganda."

That should be too much even for you to swallow, Henry; when have we found these lords and dukes bothering about democracy?

Dear Sir,—

I would esteem it a favour if you would put before your Executive Committee the following suggestion:

That at some meeting or meetings of the members of your organisation, a speaker of the British Empire Union be permitted to give an address on "General Economics" and on "Communism." The address to last for about one hour, and a subsequent half-an-hour to be used for questioning our speaker on the subject dealt with. I would like to point out in all sincerity that the British Empire Union is strictly non-party. It owes allegiance to no other political organisation in this city, and the propaganda is directed against Communist, Bolshevik, and Extremist agitators only, who, I think, are seeking to undermine the Trade Unions. No doubt you will have seen in the "News of the World" of October 8th, 1922, an extract from a confidential report we had says the "Communist" will endeavour to place in an unpopular position officials and leaders by pressing issues which force them to take an unpopular stand. I might add that at no time has the British Empire Union interfered in any way in legitimate Trade Union disputes. In fact, we are an independent organisation with a working-class membership, existing to combat "Anti-Democratic Propaganda."

Yours faithfully,

J. McGUIRK HUGHES,
Secretary.

Comrades interested in furthering the movement by Dramatic Art are asked to write to Arthur G. Thackery, 54 Dulwich Road, Greenwich, S.E.

ESPERANTO.

Any statement can be turned into a question by putting CU before it. CU may be regarded as a question-mark (?).

Si estas bela, she is beautiful.
CU si estas bela?—? si estas bela, i.e., Is she beautiful?

La monto estas alta, the mountain is high.
Cu la monto estas alta? Is the mountain high?

Note that CU does not disturb the word-order in the original statement. As there is no similar "question-word" in English, we use various devices to indicate a question. Sometimes in English the question is merely indicated by raising the voice; sometimes by introducing the word **do** and **did**.

He speaks, li parolas. Does he speak? Cu li parolas?

He is speaking,* li parolas. Is he speaking? Cu li parolas?

*In conversation, no distinction is made between **he speaks** and **he is speaking**; both are **li parolas**. But, as will be seen later, the difference can be shown if desired.

He spoke, li parolis (IS denotes the past tense in Esperanto).

Did he speak? Cu li parolis.

Do, does, and did in such cases are not translated into Esperanto.

Exercise.

Turn all the statements in the previous exercises into questions; e.g., Cu la floro estas bela? etc.

Past Tense of Verbs.

IS denotes the past time (or past tense, as the grammar books say).

Present time (tense): Mi komprenas, I understand.

Past time (tense): Mi komprenis, I understood.

Present time (tense): Mi parolas, I speak (am speaking).

Past time (tense): Mi parolis, I spoke (was speaking).

Use all the verbs in Lesson 3 in the past tense; e.g., mi demandis, I asked; la birdo flugis, the bird flew; la birdo kantis, the bird sang.

Now use CU with the past tense; that is to say, turn all the statements into questions; e.g., vi komprenis, you understood; cu vi komprenis, did you understand? La birdo kantis, the bird sang; cu la birdo kantis, did the bird sing?

NE, not, or no.

Mi komprenas, I understand; mi ne komprenas, I do not understand; mi komprenis, I understood; mi ne komprenis, I did not understand.

Note that in English we do not say "I understand"; we introduce another word. Similarly, in the past, we introduce **did**, and say I did not understand. The words **do** and **did** do not, of course, appear in Esperanto in such cases.

Translate: I did not speak (parolis); I do not understand (komprenas); I did not understand; did you understand? Did you speak (vi, you). The bird did not sing. La kapitalistoj ne laboras. Cu la kapitalistoj laboras?

LA KOMUNISTA MANIFESTO.

Daŭriga.

Ni vidas do: la rimedoj de produktado kaj interŝanĝado sur kies fondaĵo la kapitalistoj sin elkonstruis estis naskitaj en la feŭda socio. Ĉe difinita punkto en la disvolvigo de tiu rimedoj de produktado kaj interŝanĝado, kondiĉoj sub kiuj la feŭda socio produktis kaj interŝanĝis, la feŭda organizo de terkulturo kaj la fabriki industrio, unuvorte la feŭda rilatoj de propeco, fariĝis ne plu kunigebloj kaj la jam disvolvitaĵoj produktaj povoj; la fariĝis tiom multe da katenoj. Ili devigis disrompataj; ili estis disrompataj.

Daŭrigota.

Central London Branch (Hon. Secretary S. Cahill) meets Thursday evenings, 152 Fleet Street, 7.30 p.m. Volunteers for meetings, clerical work, etc., should write the Secretary at 152 Fleet Street.

ON THE RAND.
By Isaac Vermont.
HOW GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS BURNT BENONI WORKERS' HALL.

The following, from "The Weekly Herald" (the official organ of the South African Industrial Federation), illustrates "South African Justice," and as long as the present Capitalist system exists there will be one law for the workers and another for Government incendiaries. Stronger evidence on this matter could scarcely be given:

On Monday evening, March 13th, 1922, when the Government forces had subdued the revolutionaries and the Government troops were in possession of the town of Benoni, guards were placed at the entrance of the Workers' Hall. Most of the workers were under arrest, and those who were not under arrest were confined to their homes after 7 p.m., owing to the martial-law regulations. On this particular evening, between the hours of 9 and 10, the Benoni Fire Brigade was sent on a fool's errand to the Modder Deep. Having created a thirst, some of their number went out of their way to call at the staff mess, New Modderfontein, and whilst there regaled themselves with light refreshments. They returned to Benoni in time to see the Workers' Hall in flames."

The Fire Brigade had been called to Modder Deep by a 'phone message. There was no telephonic communication between Benoni and Modder Deep because the telephone wires had been cut; but the connections between certain Government buildings and the Telephone Exchange were still intact. During the absence of the Fire Brigade the Hall was wantonly and deliberately set on fire by certain individuals, two of whom, dressed in Government uniforms, drove up in a Ford motor-car to the back entrance of the Workers' Hall, went to the side, and either set it on fire or instructed others to do so, because when they came out the building was on fire. The fire, however, died down. They then drove away, and came back with several tins of petrol or paraffin, and again went inside the Hall, and this time there was no mistake.

The building was insured, both for ordinary and riot insurance, for about half its value. Lloyds refused to pay out on the riot, and up to the present have refused to accept service of summons in this country, which means that if the case is taken to Court it would have to be fought in the English Courts, and each director summoned individually. Several witnesses who are still in the Government's employ were prepared to make an affidavit and swear on oath who was responsible for the burning of the Hall, if we could only get the assurance that they would not be kicked out of the service for so doing.

To this end the Minister for Justice was approached, with a view to protecting these men in order to get at the truth officially.

A deputation was appointed from the Benoni Branch, consisting of D. D. Reich and W. S. Lewis, together with Mr. W. Madeley, Member of the South African Legislature. Mr. Madeley rang up the Minister, and was informed that he refused to discuss the matter with any deputation from the Union, but would see him personally, alone.

What we would like to know is, why is the Government so ready and willing to punish the strikers, whilst it deliberately shields its own people who are equally guilty?

Who sent the 'phone message to the fire station, when all outside wires were already cut and the connections destroyed?

Why was there no record kept and placed before the inquiry of that particular call?

Who was the sergeant of the Transvaal Scottish who told the Fire Master that the Hall was full of bombs?

Why was the ground not disturbed where the supposed bombs were lying?

Why did not the sergeant prevent these and official incendiaries from setting fire to the place if he knew there were bombs present?

Why were certain Kaffir police boys allowed to take bombs into the Hall on the Monday

afternoon, and place them in rows upon the table—bombs which had been collected outside?

Why did the Management Committee fail to find bombs, guns or ammunition when a thorough search was made a day or so before the trouble broke out?

Why did the Management Committee issue instructions to all concerned that the Hall should only be used for strike meetings, and should be immediately locked up at the close of such meeting?

Why, since the Government is so ready to shield the individuals who set fire to the Hall, does it not restore the damage they have done, seeing that the Hall was a public benefit to the citizens of Benoni?

Why the workers are not entitled to the same amount of justice as are the Government forces and the employers; and, if they are, why the Government does not see that they get it?

The workers will not get the same amount of justice until the system of society which is represented here by the Chamber of Mines and its tools, the Government, is abolished, and a saner and more equitable regime is ushered in by the victorious proletariat.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

Gaucherics: six poems by George Slocombe, privately printed in Paris.

On opening the book one sees first a portrait of the author, a woodcut by Julian E. Levi. It is very poor in drawing. Our fathers would not have tolerated the bad drawing which is accepted in woodcuts nowadays. Nevertheless, the woodcut makes the author appear a kindly, sympathetic fellow, rather sad, rather tired.

One finds his poems, for the most part, not exactly poetry; yet they produce an impression; they have breadth and a pictorial quality—they bring to our minds the visions the writer is describing:

Fainting by the roadside,
Dying like flies in winter,
Flee the panic-stricken populations,
Crowd the maddened, fugitive people
At the first sight of the white horses
Of the vengeance of the Tsars,
Faint and die in the desert
The hungry millions of the lost people,
Women and children first.

Semenoff,
Ally of the little yellow-faced men,
Threatens by wireless from Vladivostok,
And in Paris,
Paradise of the counter-revolutionists,
The irreconcilable
Bourtzeff
Rubs his hands
And calls for ink
And paper
And a pen dipped in gall."

It is not exactly poetry, but one sees it: it creates a broad, vivid impression of vast happenings.

The third poem: "To Certain Trade Union Leaders" is a strange production to issue from one of the staff of the "Daily Herald," the organ of the Trade Union Labour Party. There is truth in it, much truth; it is bitter and harsh towards the Trade Union leader. It is cruel, so cruel that it is even a little unfair; for, weak and faulty as they were, those Trade Union leaders did not fully understand what they were doing. It is over long to quote, yet we will quote it for what there is in it of truth, although it is bitter, and even cruel:

TO CERTAIN TRADE UNION LEADERS.

In the times when there were Trade Unions You were very efficient secretaries, Organising Labour all day long

To the noise of clinking typewriters and tea Being poured out into little yellow teacups By little yellow-haired stenographers.

You were very often efficient in receiving reporters

And discoursing to them judiciously Like any Privy Councillor picking his teeth,

With one eye on the clock
And another on an appointment with the Prime Minister,

Of the dangers of a national lock-out.
You deplored this, and then that
You were always deploring something.
Your favourite "deplore" was the word

strike,
It had such an ugly sound,
A blow.

As if it meant exactly what it does mean—
Even a blow in the dark.

(You do not wait to ask a thief to turn his body round
Before you strike him down.
That is, not an ordinary thief.)

A blow in the dark
On a wet night,
When the electricians have cut off the street lighting.

All day you hurried from appointment to appointment
In taxi-cabs,
Wearing a look of importance

For the benefit of newspaper photographers.
At the week-ends you spoke at meetings,
Large untidy and restless meetings, full of smoke,

And you urged the formation of a Central Staff
For a war that (you thought)
Would never come;

And all the time you were busy
Building up a great Fighting Fund
For a fight.

You betrayed before it began.
And then in that old grey-stone building
Set up by Trade Unionists centuries before
you were born,

That you patronise and call (yet with justifiable pride)

The 'Ouse,
Or the 'Ouse of Commons
(But never short commons).

You were the pride of your Party (whichever your Party was).

You were very much at home
in the little Bar below stairs,
Where the noise of division-bells
Drifted down happily through the smoke
Of Sir William Sutherland's cigars,

And strikes were very faint,
Far-off, unhappy and foolish things,
Not to be compared
With the joys of Progress

And the successes of legitimate
Or-gan-i-sa-tion.
Thoughts of
A great national danger
Brought tears into your eyes
And a sudden energy into the querulous hands

(So long unacquainted with work)
With which you banged the table at unruly
Conferences

And energetically you would rush round
Avoiding the hollows worn in the Downing
Street pavement.

By your assiduous feet,
And see the P.M.
And at his breakfast-table
Reassure him between mouthfuls of bacon and
kidney

'That all was well in the Welsh heaven.
But there came a time
When Liberty came blushing like the
lightning

And blasted the green oaks,
And shrivelled up into small flame
The dead and dying underbrush
About their feet.

And some little souls
Took fear and fainted and were swept aside
In this new world where the division-bell
Rings no longer between drinks
in the bar of the 'Ouse.

There is more tenderness in "The Miners' Women," from which we will quote one verse:

"And with your heart and limbs like lead,
Before the trembling old wives' wall,
You'll leave the barely-covered dead
To pack the living's dinner-pail."

Concerning Politics.

Certain workers have been thinking, fellow-worker; they have been thinking about the Trade Unions and the Labour Party.

Until recently they considered those institutions all that a worker could desire, but now they have been thinking, fellow-worker, and they feel dissatisfied.

They remember Black Friday, and they say: "The Triple Alliance failed. There must be something wrong with the Trade Unions."

They remember that the engineers were also beaten in their recent efforts to resist the employers' attack on their wages (they happen to have been engineers; they are on the dole now). They observe that all the other workers are getting their wages cut, and they say again: "There must be something wrong with the Unions."

They are on the dole; they have been on the dole for a long time, and the dole has a tendency to grow smaller instead of larger, so again they say: "There must be something wrong with the Trade Unions."

They consider the great organisation of 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 workers in the Trade Unions and Labour Party, and they say again: "There must be something wrong with these organisations, because they have not been able to protect the workers against the onslaughts of the employing class."

These certain workers, fellow-worker, have been reading the "Workers' Dreadnought" for some time past; it has helped them in the very great effort of thinking thus far: it has assisted them to arrive at a conclusion. That is really a very important event in their mental development.

Their conclusion is:

We must be in a One Big Union.

They have got thus far, and there they have stopped.

Some time will pass, fellow-worker, before they begin to think again.

They have not considered what the structure of the Union ought to be. They were in the shop stewards' movement; but, bless you, fellow-worker, they never understood wherein the real advantage of the shop stewards' organisation lay. They have not put two and two together and understood that it was the workshop basis, providing a rank and file of active, responsible co-operators, with the unpaid delegates, subject to recall and never leaving their position of workers at bench and forge, in mine and shipyard; that it was the organisation at the point of production and along the lines of production, distribution and transport which were the real strength of that movement.

These certain workers, who had begun to think and now have stopped thinking again, have not realised that it was the Soviet or Workers' Council form that gave the shop stewards' movement its value, and that this form must be adopted by any One Big Union if it is really to be an efficient fighting organ in the coming great clash with the Capitalist system.

The coming great clash with the Capitalist system: those words bring us to another point, fellow-worker, a very important point: the most important point of all.

Your wages have fallen, fellow-workers: your wages began to fall as the trade of your employers began to fall, just as they rose when your employers were busy with war work, and your brothers were mobilised in the Army and Navy, so that Labour was scarce. When your employer's business is slack; when he has few customers and can afford to wait; when the customers find many manufacturers competing for their orders, and the manufacturers find many workers competing for a job: then wages go down, and even a One Big Union could not stop the fall, unless it were prepared for a fight with Capitalism that might smash Capitalism.

In that case, if Capitalism found that the workers were on the point of overthrowing it, it would even pinch itself to provide bigger wages for the workers, to stop the struggle; but even in that case, Capitalism would bide its time and begin nibbling away at those wages again as soon as the immediate danger to its existence had passed.

Then the One Big Union would have to begin the fight again, and either it would have to fight in earnest to overthrow Capitalism, or, in the long run, it would become little better than the present Unions.

Those certain workers who have been thinking have not thought the matter out so far as that.

They have thought: "We must have a One Big Union. Everyone must be in it; all the Dubs, and the snobs, and the scabs, as well as the class-conscious workers, even the members of the B.E.U. and the British Legion. They must all be in it: we must not offend anyone; no, not one."

Therefore, they have thought: "We must have nothing to do with Communism, nothing to do with smashing the Capitalist system; nothing to do with the abolition of wage-slavery. All that is politics! We had better give up thinking any more, in case when our opinions get known, they might keep some lover of Capitalism, or some poor unawakened Henry Dub from joining our One Big Union."

Poor sleepy old Dubs; are you not sorry for them, fellow-worker? Never mind, they will wake up and begin to think again presently. Do not doubt it.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT MEETINGS.

Sunday, January 28th.—7.30 p.m., Hamilton Hall, Willesden Green. S. Pankhurst, A. Jarvis.

Friday, February 2nd.—8 p.m., Minerva Café (top floor).

Friday, February 16th.—8 p.m., Minerva Café (top floor).

Sunday, February 18th.—7.30 p.m., Old William Morris Hall, North Street, Clapham. S. Pankhurst.

Sunday, February 25th.—Workers' Friend Club, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel. S. Pankhurst.

Sunday, January 28th.—11.30 a.m., High-bury Corner. W. Hall, J. Welsh.

COMMUNIST ESPERANTO GROUPS.
Manchester and District meets every Friday, 8 p.m., at Labour College, 32A Dale Street, Manchester. Secretary, H. B. Robinson, 10 Jane Street, Eccles New Road, Salford, Manchester.

PUBLIC MEETING HAMILTON HALL,

375 High Road, WILLESDEN GREEN.

Sunday, January 28th,
At 7.30 p.m.

Speakers:

Sylvia Pankhurst A. Jarvis.
Admission Free. Collection.

PROTEST MEETING

Against the Invasion of the Ruhr.

Sunday, January 27th,
From 3 to 6 p.m.

INTERNATIONAL SPORTING CLUB.

25 Noel Street, Wardour Street, W.

Speakers in English and Italian.

Entrance Free.

Agents and canvassers wanted in London and the provinces.—Apply the Manager, "Workers' Dreadnought," 152 Fleet Street, E.C. 4.



DREADNOUGHT BOOK CLUBS AND READING CIRCLES.

Comrades are invited to form autonomous reading groups, open to all shades of proletarian thought.

Membership cards for each group will be provided, if desired, on payment of 6d. to cover postage.

Books may be obtained on easy terms. Particulars on application to the "Dreadnought" Bookshop, 152 Fleet Street, E.C.

Courses of study on history, economics, literature, science, etc., recommended to groups and individuals.

Baudelaire:

Prose Poems 1/-

William Blake:

The Marriage of Heaven and Hell; and a Song of Liberty 5/-

Illustrations to the Book of Job 5/-

Selections from the Works of 2/6

Samuel Butler:

God: Known and Unknown 1/- and 5/-

Erewhon: or Over the Edge 7/6

The Way of All Flesh 7/6

Byron:

Poetical and Dramatical Works (3 vols.) (each) 2/-

Chaucer:

Canterbury Tales 2/-

Dostoleffsky

Crime and Punishment 2/6

Prison Life in Siberia 2/6

The Idiot 2/6

Poor Folk and the Gambler 2/6

George Eliot:

Mill on the Floss 2/-

Silas Marner 2/-

Romola 2/-

Adam Bede 2/-

Anatole France:

The Red Lily 2/-

Thais 2/-

Penguin Island 2/-

The Crime of Sylvestre Bonnard ... 2/-

Crinquebille 7/6

John Galsworthy:

In Chancery 9/6

The Country House 6/- and 2/-

Fraternity 6/- and 2/-

The Patrician 6/- and 2/-

The Man of Property 6/- and 2/-

Nicol Gogol:

Dead Souls 2/-

Tarus Bulba and Other Tales 2/-

Maxim Gorki:

Through Russia: Short Stories 2/-

Three of Them 4/0

In the World 6/-

My Childhood 6/-

Sunday, February 4th and 11th.—Brotherhood Church, Southgate Road. Sylvia Pankhurst will speak on "Communism."

לעזת און פארשפרייט דעם ארבעטער פריינד

אנארכיסטיש-קאמוניסטישער ארגאן
דער אקטיווער פון דער "דריי" און זאלקונד.

ערשיינט צוויי וועכענטלאך.
איינצעלנער פארקויפ פ. א קאפיע.

אבאנאמענט:
ערלאזן 6ש, און אפערקא 1.50 ד.

זו ארדעסען:
"WORKERS FRIEND"
163, Jubilee Street, London, E. 1.

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