

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR GOING TO THE ROOT.

Vol. XI. No. 6

April 26th, 1924

WEEKLY.

The Ferrer School by Prince Hopkins.

When I first visited the Ferrer School in New York, it was housed in some abominable little quarters down by St. Marks Place, just off the Bowery. After that, it moved to quarters far uptown, but which were almost equally inadequate.

My impressions were not good. This resulted in the first place from the fact that the idea of a school based upon liberty was new to me, I was unwilling to make allowances when I saw certain things neglected which the ordinary school places in the first rank of duties, but which, as judged by the standard of real life, are useless or harmful. Among such things are the stereotyped order of studies, the tomb-like class-room silence, and the exaggerated respect paid to the authority of the teacher.

But there were also some other defects, which resulted from other causes. The cramped quarters, the poverty, the fact that the children came in largely after having fatigued themselves with a full day in the regular city schools, were great handicaps.

But in spite of all obstacles, by the sheer driving power of the idea of a school based upon freedom, and the self-denying idealism of Harry Kelly and a few other devoted comrades, this little effort survived to the day when its backers, borrowing funds, subscribing a few dollars out of their small working-class wages, and boldly trusting the future to wipe out the remaining deficit, purchased a piece of land at Stelton, New Jersey.

The school was made the centre of the new colony. The community, however, was not merely school. It was a place to which anarchists and heretics of all kinds could come, and live more cheaply than in the city, at the same time that they enjoyed not only the country air, but the society of others of like minds with themselves. Withal, Stelton was near enough to New York so that members of the colony whose work was in the great city could, if they wished, go back and forth daily.

This combination of school and colony proved a very fortunate idea. The colonists sent their own children to the school. They also had friends out over week ends, who became interested in the ideas of the school and sent children to it. On the other hand, the school provided an excuse, and a nuclear idea, for the colony. So the two grew together.

In some ways the site might have been more wisely selected. The country around Stelton is about as dreary and uninteresting as you could find anywhere. The colony certainly didn't attract anyone from the artistic standpoint. Cheapness was its sole recommendation. Nevertheless people came, and set up their little wooden shacks. With only a few boards to shut out the cold blasts of a climate to which England has hardly anything to compare in winter, these hardy pioneers stuck it out, year after year.

The lack of funds drove the members to one measure, which I for one have

always deeply regretted. Under the pressure of circumstances, they yielded to the advice of the individualistic faction among their membership, and declared for private ownership of land. Lots were sold on the freehold principle, and passed out forever from the control of the Community. Recently a cooperative store flourished for some time in the colony, but during the great part of its history, the only common enterprise was the school itself.

From the beginning, as I've said, the central principle of the school was that of complete liberty, limited only by the equal liberty of others. This has been maintained not merely in principle, but in practice, with very great consistency. When the school moved from New York to Stelton, and became a place where the children lived and boarded, a number of problems arose which made the adherence to this rule very difficult; and some slight infringements of the letter of unqualified freedom were conceded to the realities of the situation. For instance, on an ice winter morning, many, if not most, of the children would undoubtedly have remained in their warm beds, were they not good-naturedly but firmly pulled out of them.

Nevertheless, according to at least to my own reaction, the school would have benefited by more discipline rather than by less. In particular, I had the feeling that all should be made to do their share of the unpleasant tasks about the place, and to be more responsible for the communal property. I once or twice sent a present of garden tools or other materials to the children, only to find that by the time of my next visit, they'd all been lost.

Another regard in which the libertarian principle seemed to me to have received an excessive emphasis, came up in the classes and conferences of the children, when some issue was being discussed in which all were greatly interested. At such times, all members of the group would talk at once, regardless of whether there were any to listen, or of how much each prevented anyone else being heard. Any suggestion that a chairman be appointed, or an order of speaking be decided upon, always met with strong disapproval on the score that it would infringe personal liberty.

In the sphere of academic progress, the effect of liberty was a mixed one. The children naturally objected to much in the ordinary school program, as having not the slightest bearing upon real life; at least as life touched them. If a teacher hadn't the power to make a subject entertaining, the younger children shunned it in favor of other occupations which had a greater appeal. The immediate result, therefore, was a program of studies which departed radically from that of outside schools.

When, however, these children came of an age beyond which the Ferrer School was unprepared to carry their studies, so that it was a question of their attending soon, the high-school in the neighboring city of Patterson, a change came over

them. Their attitude seemed to become suddenly highly purposive. They began to work very hard, of their own accord, upon the subjects, in which, they knew, they were deficient according to the common school standards. At the time of my last visit to Stelton, this had resulted in their so thoroughly making up their deficiencies, that the Patterson school authorities, passing upon the standing of Stelton graduates who were in their charge, had made special mention of their excellent preparation.

This would certainly seem to be a very complete vindication of the free method, from an academic standpoint. Furthermore, there are other evidences of true education which the authorities of the common schools are all too prone to minimise.

One of these is, that, in contrast with children who have been graduated from a school in which reading, writing, and arithmetic are "taught at the end of a hickory stick," the child from a free school goes forth with real interest in these subjects for their own sakes. Never having been driven to them, but only led, he has formed no unpleasant association between them and enforced penal servitude in a foul aired and hard-benched school-room. The strongest evidence of this at Stelton was the tremendous interest of the children in all forms of art, and perhaps especially in good literature. I never visited the school without being asked by eager children to read some of the great English poets, or hearing them voice their original yet thoughtful appreciation of masterpieces in various fields of human endeavor. This of course, in a wholly unaffected, naive, way.

Another trend taken by the conversation of this school, as compared to that of almost any other, was about public affairs. This had an evil side as well as a good one, the children retailed all the scandals of the colony, which were by no means the less numerous because in theory its members justified freedom of every individual in all that didn't interfere with others. But this topic of conversation was, for the children, only one of many wider and more wholesome ones in which they were interested. One heard from them the most divergent views on all matters of the day, partly quoted from their elders, of course, but also obviously formed as the result of considerable reading and — best of all — of independent thought.

It is the capacity for this last which is, I think, the most valuable contribution which the Ferrer School has made. I was much puzzled, on one occasion of my visiting the school, and after I had listened to a speech from one of the pupils in the Current Events class which was, to be sure, somewhat unbalanced in its boyish ardour, to have the teacher profusely explain to me that the school didn't teach such dogmatic views. This fact was sufficiently obvious from the views of the other pupils. I have since found an explanation for it, in a struggle which was at that time

Continued from page 1.)

evidently going on in that teacher's own unconscious mind. He left the Ferrer school shortly afterward, and became one of those communists more bitter than observant of human nature, who preach that the working class should imbue their children with economic theories dogmatically, instead of developing their capacity to think for themselves. Just as if children didn't frequently turn against the dogmatic views of their fathers for the precise reason, that they are the views of their fathers!

This teacher although he started as a minister, was one of the pioneers in America of modern progressive movements. He fairly wore himself out, fighting for them. Without his efforts, speaking for the Ferrer idea, and raising funds, it could hardly have struggled through its early years. But the effect of it all upon himself, was to sour him. The school never came into real success until more recent years, when there were appointed its present heads, Mr. and Mrs. Fern. Although no longer young, this couple brought with them both a power of organization, and a great love of children and belief in the possibilities of free humanity, upon which largely the present success of the school are founded.

There are now about two hundred pupils in daily attendance. Some of these are boarders, and others are children of the colonists. I can't say what are the proportions of each, I believe that the courses are still carried up to the beginning of high-school only, but this is because of lack of resources, which it is hoped time will remedy as it has slowly remedied many of the deficiencies of the past. Harry Kelly, has met the first tentatives of success in a campaign to get the backing of the more class-conscious of the labour unions. He is endeavoring to show them, that this is essentially a school of the working class, worthy of their financial support. He has as his ultimate aim, to see a genuine Workers' College at Stelton, of which the school for younger children shall be only one department.

One thing which has undoubtedly militated against the Ferrer school and colony, is the fact that membership isn't more broadly representative. The most intellectual, the most progressively alert, of America's immigrants, are undoubtedly the Jews. They contribute an essential support to every forward movement; and inevitably they were the backbone of the Ferrer Modern School at Stelton, and of its offspring, the Walt Whitman School in Los Angeles. But both these schools became so predominantly Jewish, that many workers came to look upon them as purely orthodox Jewish institutions. It was probably for this reason chiefly that the Los Angeles effort came to grief; and the mother institution at Stelton has undoubtedly suffered from it. How to handle this situation, is an unsolved problem.

Another question before the colony today, is that of how far the plan of liberty in the school should be followed to its logical extreme, and how far it should be trimmed to meet the bare requirements of the outside school-system. As might be expected, the community is split into two factions on this matter. I believe the Ferns told me they are heart-sick at having to put what pressure they do today upon the children to attend regular classes and prepare themselves for the conventional outside world. On the other hand, there is an increasingly large group among the colonists, who desire chiefly that their children shall be prepared to earn a living. To them, the principles of freedom are often only verbal formulae. They practice

them when convenient.

For the time being, I can only say that the institution is in good hands.

I know of few more delightful experiences, than to take the seven o'clock train from New York, arriving at Stelton before the big bell summons all the children to the neat new schoolhouse (constructed by the common labor of the colonists and their invited guests over many a week-end). Mrs. Fern takes her seat at the piano, and commences to play inspiring music. Some of the children remain outside, spinning tops, or amusing themselves; but over half of them enter the room, and, for an hour or two, go through various exercises and dances, collective and individual, some formal, but as many, original. Some of the children of course drift from one of these groups to the other.

Then classes form themselves outdoors or in various rooms. Nearly all of these have some constructive basis. Some children are making a magazine, and they must write articles for it, select the most pleasing, illustrate them, and finally manage either to set up the type for printing, or produce the magazine on a hectograph or mimeograph. Other children are learning to paint — and an exhibition of their works, held annually in New York, excites great interest and admiration. The older children will be asking for help on, or correction of, their lessons in the standard school subjects.

Above all things one notices these two — universal creative delight, and universal mutual helpfulness. Fill the world with the spirit of these two things, under freedom, — how it would be changed!

(This article has been supplied by Miss Hodson, The Communist Life, 36, St. Peter's Hill, Grantham.)

NEWS FROM INDIA.

The Society of Rajasthan Sewa Singh in India is one which binds the villagers together for mutual service and to resist injustice, especially the hated system of Begar, a kind of forced labour which is either unpaid or ill-paid. The Society has been non-violent and Law-abiding, but the Rajputana authorities have endeavoured to destroy it.

The following complaints against the action of the authorities are made by the Society:

"Peaceful and unarmed men and women were suddenly attacked and beaten with lathies at Amergarh. In the districts of Parsoli and Basi and in several of the villages of the Kachola district. The case was brought to the notice of the Mahakma Khas, but no public enquiry was instituted, although several people were wounded. Some of them had their hands and feet broken, and one man actually succumbed to the injuries.

"Peaceful people were fired on twice at Begun. On the first occasion it was the Jagir authorities themselves who had the poor people shot down, although they had no right to do so, because they never got permission from the Newar Government. The people who were the authors of these atrocities were never taken to task and thus they were incessantly being encouraged in their cruel deeds.

"The Singh was searched on the pretext that there were some seditious papers that were required to be exposed. All the written documents, printed papers, correspondence, books, etc., were taken away by the police without preparing any list, as enjoined by law. There were illegalities in their perusal as well.

"When nothing objectionable could be found in these papers, the officials repre-

sending different States were sent for, and all the papers were laid before them, so that they might note down the names and addresses of the correspondents and helpers of the Singh, in order to cause them trouble, and if possible to file cases against them. But they could discover no such material.

"It was not until Mr. Pathik protested against the official high-handedness and there was a strong agitation in the press, that these surreptitious and illegal proceedings were stopped. But as a result of these secret exploitations several papers were lost.

"The British police and C. I. D. were offered to Bundi, Udaipur and other States. Taking advantage of the "No law régime" of the native States, they arrested many people and sentenced them without giving them facilities to defend themselves, or kept them on remand for the prolonged period of one year, and sometimes of two. For example, one could cite the cases of Pandit Naini, Dam Sharma, Bhanwar, lalji Visharad from Bundi, and those of Pandit Gopi, lall Sharma, Swami Permand ji and Sri Lakshoni narayan Bhat from Newar.

"After the arrest of Mr. Pathik, Srijuts Ram naries Chodhri and Sobba lall Gupta were carrying on the work of Singh. They were the only persons who could effectively help Mr. Pathik in the case instituted against him by the Mewar State. Now they too are arrested under the pretext of publishing two articles in the Tarun Rajasthan, although as a rule, a warning is considered sufficient on the first occasion. The police have been authorised to charge them under any other section as well if they choose to do so."

The subscribers register has been taken possession of by the police, consequently the press and the paper are suffering heavily.

Mr. K. Rahat writes:—

"Mr. Pathik is being tried at Chittorgarh. If the Commissioners are left to themselves there is every probability of his being acquitted, but there are interested parties and there are wire pullers behind the scenes who are too influential to be ignored. It seems that the British officials and the State authorities have formed a clique and they are out to crush this Rajasthan Sewa Singh, which is the only institution of its kind in India. If they succeed in throwing these gentlemen into prison, they are expected to launch out upon a policy of wholesale repression. "Could you manage to get a question raised in Parliament through some friend, about these illegalities and tyrannies?"

DREADNOUGHT £1,000 FUND

Brought forward £222-0-11½. G. Bredlik 3/6; S.N. Ghose 5/-; I. A. Cahill 10/-; S. Palmer 1/- (monthly); R. Jacobs 1/1½; Anon 2/-; Office Collecting Box 9d. Total for fortnight £1-3-4½. Total £223-4-4.

SPICE

Housing Scheme
Bricks mount in price.

Imperialism

£1 a week for men and 15/- a week for women lavatory attendants for 14½ hours work a day at Wembley.

Has your workshop bought a ticket for the Wembley Fellowship?

The "Workers Dreadnought" may be obtained from Mr. A. Turner, 25, Windmill Lane, Stratford.

THE GOVERNMENT AND AGRICULTURE By The Man With The Hoe

We find the inhabitants of this earth divided into two great masses; the peasant paymaster — spade in hand, original imperial producers of turnips, and waiting on them all round a crowd of polite persons modestly expectant of turnips, for some too often theoretical service, as John Ruskin says.

It is because those of us who get our living on the soil can see the truth of Ruskin's words, that we protest against the economic and social crime committed against the most useful of all citizens, and without whom not only the present civilization, but Society itself could not exist.

No occupation or industry of any kind has the number of critics that the food producer has, and the set of critics know as little about the subject at issue as those who criticise him. Unfortunately the great mass of our critics find it much more remunerative to write articles, or make speeches in Parliament than to take a farm and show us how to do the job.

With parrot-like devotion to formula, the Labour Party from MacDonald downward tells us that if we will only copy the methods of Denmark and Germany, by organisation through cooperation, we, like they, will get over all our economic troubles in production, and the consumer will gain. Of course none of these wise men tell either us, the producers, or the industrial consuming public that neither of those countries has been allowed to degenerate into the dumping ground for all the sweated goods, food, raw material, etc., that has made it possible to build up the industrial capitalist system for profit in this country, to the detriment of the producers.

Both Denmark and Germany protect the interests of their first producers, because they are wise enough to see that the country which depends on its commercial competitors — which are always its political national enemies in the case of war — are terribly handicapped to start with. Therefore Bismarck and every succeeding Chancellor in Germany have seen the wisdom of a strong, virile rural organisation to grow all the food possible, despite the antagonism of the industrial capitalist class. This class, like its English predecessors, wanted cheaper food, in order to get cheap wage slaves to produce cheaper commodities, to enable them to capture foreign markets, in competition with England especially.

In the case of Denmark, the Government of this agricultural country has, for the last forty years, given assistance to produce and collect the production as economically as possible, and to export, for the most part to this country (England). Thus co-operation has been encouraged to a very large degree. But what none of these people tell us producers whom they want to copy Denmark and Germany, is what economic standard of life the producer and distributor of food in those countries obtain, measured in hours and wages. I make bold to suggest that the cost of production and distribution of food stuffs in this country in wages and overhead charges, is 60 to 75 per cent higher than in either of these countries. Most of that extra cost is on distribution and not on actual production at all.

The one thing above all others that perplexes me with this argument about co-operation here, is the fact that almost every Labour Member of Parliament, as well as Cabinet Ministers, is a member of some co-operative society. Evidently most of them take about as much interest in their society as they have real knowledge of the

agricultural industry and production.

I expect every Labour M.P. in the East End, as well as in other parts of London, is a member of the London Co-operative Society. If they look at their balance sheets they will find over £4,000 loss on the farm for the last half year. Enfield Society shows the same. Woolwich Society shows a loss for the half year on 118 acres of land of over £3,500. Here you have two of the biggest distributive societies in England, with a retail customer waiting for every pennyworth produced, with the best means of transport and machinery for production and distribution; every producer not only a wage earner, but a shareholder in the concern, and yet there is a loss. If the whole of the money invested in these farms had been interest free there would still have been a big loss.

What has happened to these London societies has happened on 90 per cent of the co-operative farms throughout the country. The Wholesale Co-operative Farm in Lancashire lost in 1921-22 over 97,000 pounds each year. And yet these are the people who tell us ordinary folk how to do our job!

In distribution the Co-operative Society has been a huge success when in competition with other distributors who pay the same rate of wages as themselves. With regard to production, they come into competition with food commodities produced under other economic standards of life, from the Dane to the Ryot of India and the Coolie of China. Then they fail just as we other producers fail, only their failure is greater, despite their advantages of cheap money and up-to-date methods of production and distribution.

As a Communist I stand now, as I have stood for years, for the confiscation of all land, factories and the means of life whereby the people live (my own land and implements included). But so precarious is the agricultural industry in this country, owing to the unfair competition imposed upon it by industrial capitalism in its own economic interest, that if all land were rent free to the producer and capital were lent him at half his present payment of contract, he could neither get himself, nor pay his man Hodge an economic existence equal to that of the road sweeper in Poplar or West Ham.

PROUDHON ON EDUCATION

A community needs a teacher. It chooses one at its pleasure, young or old, married or single, a graduate of the Normal School or self-taught, with or without a diploma. The only thing that is essential is that the said teacher should suit the fathers of families, and that they should be free to entrust their children to him or not. In this, as in other matters, it is essential that the transaction should be a free contract and subject to competition; something that is impossible under a system of inequality, favouritism, and university monopoly, or that of a coalition of Church and State.

As for the so-called higher education, I do not see how the protection of the State is needed, any more than in the former case. Is it not the spontaneous result, the natural focus of lower instruction? Why should not lower instruction be centralized in each district, in each province, and a portion of the funds destined for it be applied to the support of higher schools that are thought necessary, of which the teaching staff should be chosen from that of the lower schools. Every soldier, it is said, carries a marshal's baton in his knapsack. If that is not true, it ought to be. Why should not every teacher bear in his diploma the title of university professor?

Why, after the example of workingmen's associations, as the teacher is responsible to the Academic Council, should not the Academic Council, be appointed by the teachers?

Thus even with the present system of instruction, the university centralization in a democratic society is an attack upon paternal authority, and a confiscation of the rights of the teacher.

But let us go to the bottom of the matter. Governmental centralization in public instruction is impossible in the industrial system, for the decisive reason that instruction is inseparable from apprenticeship, and scientific education is inseparable from professional education. So that the teacher, the professor, when he is not himself the foreman, is before everything the man of the association of the agricultural or industrial group which employs him. As the child is the pledge, *pignus*, between the parents, so the school becomes the bond between the industrial associations and the families: it is unfitting that it should be divorced from the workshop, and, under the plea of perfecting it, should be subjected to external power.

To separate teaching from apprenticeship, as is done to-day, and, what is still more objectionable, to distinguish between professional education and the real, serious, daily, useful practice of the profession, is to reproduce in another form the separation of powers and the distinction of classes, the two most powerful instruments of governmental tyranny and the subjection of the workers.

Let the working class think of this.

If the school of arts and crafts is anything but the art or craft taught, its aim will soon be to make, not artisans, but directors of artisans, aristocrats.

If the school of commerce is anything but the store, the counting house, it will not be used to make traders, but captains of industry, aristocrats.

If the naval school is anything but actual service on board ship, including even the service of the cabin boy, it will serve only as a means of making two classes, sailors and officers.

Thus we see things go under our system of political oppression and industrial chaos. Our schools, when they are not establishments of luxury or pretexes for sinecures, are seminaries of aristocracy. It was not for the people that the Polytechnic, the Normal School, the military school at St-Cyr, the School of Law, were founded; it was to support, strengthen, and fortify the distinction between the classes, in order to complete and make irrevocable the split between the working class and the upper class.

In a real democracy, in which each member should have instruction, both ordinary and advanced, under his control in his home, this superiority from schooling would not exist. It is contradictory to the principle of society. But when education is merged in apprenticeship; when it consists, as for theory, in the classification of ideas; as for practice, in the specialization of work; when it becomes at once a matter of training the mind and of application to practical affairs in the workshop and in the house, it cannot any longer depend upon the State; it is incompatible with government. Let there be in the Republic a central bureau of education, another of manufactures and arts, as there is now an Academy of Sciences and an Office of Longitude. I see no objection. But again, what need for authority? Why such an intermediary between the student and the school room, between the shop and the apprentice, when it is not admitted between the workman and the employer?



Workers' Dreadnought

Founded 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT, 4

152, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. Post free.

Three months (13 weeks) 1s. 7½d.
Six months (26 weeks) 3s. 3d.
One year (52 weeks) 6s. 6d.
Subscriptions can start from any week.

Vol. XI. No. 6. Saturday, April 26th, 1924

Our View.

The experts' proposal on Reparations are, as was to be expected, iniquitous. They will have a crushing effect on the German workers, and by depressing the standard of life in Germany they will help to depress the economic standard of workers in other countries. The reparations payments, whether made in goods or money, will have an injurious effect on trade in other countries. The Labour Party has itself argued that reparations can only be injurious to this country, yet it accepts the Experts' Report. The pressure on the side of acceptance is as strong as was the pressure to accept the Versailles Treaty and the War itself. The Labour Party has succumbed to the pressure in spite of its previous declarations. The German have accepted the report because they are held down by the Allied Military control, which, by the way, was re-imposed largely through the instrumentality of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald a few weeks ago.

The German Chancellor, Dr. Marx, has declared that the Experts have fixed the scale of annual payments impossibly high. The Payment of £125,000,000 from the year 1928 would mean such an increase in exports as would seriously interfere with foreign markets.

As Communists we must desire to see the setting aside of all such iniquities as war indemnities and reparations, with the whole of the financial system to which they belong.

"No annexations; no indemnities," remains a good slogan. Communists can have nothing but abhorrence for such brutal visitations of conquest as the Treaty of Versailles and the present Reparations proposals.

Many of those, like the Labour Government, who accept the Experts' Report, have raised an outcry about the Ruhr occupation; yet there are some who consider the experts' proposals even more disastrous for Germany. (One of these, by the way, is the Daily Telegraph, "Political Observer"), and meanwhile M. Poincaré shows no sign of relaxing the French grip on the Ruhr.

HOW LONG WILL THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT LAST?

Mr. Lloyd George is on the war path attacking and threatening the Labour Government. He demands that the Labour Government shall consult the Liberal Party before it takes action, and shall ascertain what measures the Liberals are willing to support. He further demands that the Labour Party shall not oppose Liberal candidates in the constituencies,

and shall introduce proportional representation.

Meanwhile Mr. Garvin, on behalf on the Tories, is demanding, in the "Observer" a tri-party truce, under which the Labour Party shall legislate by consent of the other two parties until January, when another General Election would take place.

Mr. MacDonald, on the other hand, has voiced his intention to remain in office, declaring that the nation desires the General Election to be staved off, and that he "sees no reason why the country should be bethered with another General Election for two or three years."

Apparently Mr. Asquith is still disposed to allow the Labour Party to remain in office on terms, but the Lloyd George faction is determined either to secure better terms, or to turn the Labour Party out. Probably the present "wait and see" position is too slow for the mercurial temperament of Mr. Lloyd George, who desires to see something moving.

Mr. MacDonald is apparently satisfied with the present rate of progress — if it can be called progress. He says:

"It will take at least two years to put Europe on a peaceful footing, to carry out the programme regarding the League of Nations and to get industrial relations established in anything like a normal way."

The programme called up by phrases of Mr. MacDonald is of a capitalism restored to health and normalcy. We who believe that capitalism is approaching its latter stages, do not believe that that programme can be fulfilled.

Moreover, we do not desire it to be realised — we who desire that capitalism shall be brought to a speedy end. If Mr. MacDonald meant by his phrase: "to get industrial relations established in a normal way," that the capitalist system should be made to give place to a Communist system, we should be with him; but neither he nor we would set so brief a period as two years for that great work. Obviously Mr. MacDonald is referring to some hoped-for peace between Capital and Labour, between employer and employed. Such a peace never will be.

The strife of opposing interests is inherent in the wage system. The strife must inevitably grow more bitter as the workers gain in consciousness and the world expansion of capitalism narrows the sphere of markets and intensifies competition. Whilst Mr. MacDonald is striving to rebuild the capitalist system, shaken by the War, hampered by its own prolific growth, we are looking impatiently for its end.

THE INDIAN IMPASSE

The non-co-operators who decided to join the Indian Legislative Councils in order to practise obstruction have placed themselves in a peculiar position. They rejected the budget. As a result Lord Lytton has restored the votes for the expenditure the British Government desired by certificate, including the salaries of Ministers, whilst refusing to restore the votes for the salaries of officers in the Medical and Educational departments. 1,200 of these officers have been given notice. These departments, though their administration may leave much to be desired, are departments in which Indians are interested. Were it the Army or the Air Force which had been thus denuded of supplies, the matter would be different. The Indians would rejoice in that case. As it is the British Government has endeavoured to cause the action of the obstructionists to return like a boomerang against its authors. To a certain extent the British Government has succeeded in this

effort; but if the obstructionists are intrepid they will persevere, and the independence movement will apply itself to providing the educational and medical services which the British Government has withdrawn.

For our part, we always advised the independence movement against participation in the legislative councils. Complete non-co-operation was the strength of the movement, which has now been split into factions, because various sections of it have decided on various sorts of compromise.

In the Central Provinces the Governor has replied to the obstructionist tactics by dismissing the Ministers, and governing autocratically without regard to the Government of India Act. As it is euphemistically put, he has "suspended the reforms."

THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT SCANDALS

Parliamentary and Cabinet rule is certainly being shown up in a most unfavourable light by recent events across the Atlantic. The United States Government oil scandals are scarcely brought to light and other even more serious cases of corruption are beginning to be unveiled when similar Canadian scandals begin to show their heads. The Provincial Treasurer of Ontario is under arrest for corruption in connection with the Home Bank, and disclosures in the Highways and other Departments are preparing. A week later it is announced that no less a person than the ex-Premier Newfoundland, Sir Richard Squires, is under arrest, charged with larceny of 120,000 dollars from the Liquor Department and with improperly receiving 43,000 dollars from the Dominion Steel Company. The former Minister of Agriculture the former Liquor Controller, and a former clerk in the Crown.

THE I. L. P. CONFERENCE.

Pacifism has been the outstanding feature of the I. L. P., since 1914. Pacifism has had a set-back at the Party's York Conference, when the conference endorsed the foreign policy of the Labour Government and rejected a resolution calling for opposition to all expenditure on armaments.

The carrying of the previous question to a resolution calling for the abolition of religious teaching in the schools was a retrograde step.

The I. L. P. Conference adopted the confused and reformist agricultural policy put forward by its Executive, and thus repudiated the practicability of Socialism.

THE TEACHERS' CONFERENCE.

Year by year the conference of the National Union of Teachers register an ideal of public service, which is an excellent augury for the day when the occupational Soviets shall take over and run all industries and services. Year by year the Teachers' Conference earnestly devotes the greater part of its deliberations, not to questions affecting their own salaries and interests, but to the welfare of their pupils. Schools meals for necessitous children, medical and dental treatment, smaller classes, the raising of the school age, better equipment, more highly qualified teachers, improved school buildings and many question affecting the child, both in and out of school, are discussed with whole-hearted zeal by the teachers.

IMPORTANT.

You believe in the policy of the "Workers' Dreadnought," and there are many people who think like you who would like to have the paper, only they have not heard of it. Will you help us to bring it to their notice by sending us a donation towards advertising it? We need a minimum of 25s. a week for this.

FROM THE PUBLISHERS

Socialism for women by Minnie Pallister (I.L.P. 6d.) Mainly reformist, but with more socialist tendency other pamphlets in the series.

One Union for Railway Workers by P. R. Higginson (I.L.P. 2d.) Contains some suggestions which improve on the present constitution of most Unions; but it still proposes a Union, not the Workshop Councils.

The Transit of Nan by Freda Barrow. Lothian Co., Sydney and Melbourne.

Found in an old Box by Frances Fraser. Lothian Co., Sydney and Melbourne.

Poor Relief in Scotland by Alexander MacCormack, M. A., (Wylie and Son, Aberdeen, 5s.) — This is an interesting historical record, gives an exhaustive history of the monasteries, charities and Poor Law history chiefly of Aberdeen. From the original documentary evidence it gives some graphic details of the affairs of the Early Church and people. The author cites an Act of 1555 restricting various classes of people to a certain number of dishes at meals, and an Act of 1551 declaring that no lambs might be killed for three years and that no "lapronis" or young "pontis" might be killed except by noblemen with hawks.

The author says of the Church:

"While the Church of the Middle Ages possessed a very large share of the wealth of a poor country, we find complaints recorded among the clergy of misuse and of corruption. Bellenden, the pious Archdeacon of Moray, admitted in 1533 that the endowments of the Church had brought no less damage of the commonwealth than of perdition of good religion. . . . Hector Boece — (Boetius Scotorum Historia 1575), first principal of King's College, stated that the monks of the Black Friars' Monastery had fallen from their original piety into every species of luxury and indulgence. . . . Bishop Gordon, a son of Earl Huntly, . . . by his immoral conduct brought upon himself the written condemnation of his own priests. . . .

"By such licentiousness the poor undoubtedly lost a share of their endowments, seeing that their share was the surplus or balance. . . . The hospital of St. Peter gradually lost its valuable endowments at the hands of several bishops."

When the Reformation came, the Aberdonians appear to have been lukewarm about it at first, but bands from the south came up to despoil the Church of its wealth. The Earl of Huntly, brother to the licentious bishop, came forward to champion the Church, but carried off all the valuables of the cathedral for himself. The Reformers had to content themselves with the lead and woodwork. The greater part of the Church property fell into the hands of the lairds and did not pass to the new Church.

On 1st January 1558, the "Beggars' summons" was issued by the blind, the crooked, the bedridden, the widows and orphans, and all unable to work, calling upon the monks to remove themselves from the buildings and hospitals they occupied. The New Church was ordered to provide for the poor, but the order was never satisfactorily carried out.

Many ordinances against able-bodied beggars are given and a most interesting series of records is brought down to the present time. Very illuminating, as showing the truculent spirit of the time, are these rules from the Kirk Session Records of 24th June 1621, which prescribe that the poor must attend divine service every day or forfeit their week's allowance. They must not receive or entertain any person,

rich or poor, without permission of the Magistrate, on pain of being banished from the town and deprived of their allowance for ever. A conviction for swearing deprived them of their allowance for a week, a second conviction for ever, and brought corporal punishment upon them.

WOMAN IN UTOPIA

The views of Mr. H. G. Wells have changed and developed a good deal perhaps, since he wrote "A Modern Utopia." The views therein expressed are typical of many a Socialist who is not quite a Socialist, and of many a man who cannot quite bring himself to accept the equality and independence of woman, although he believes that he has done so.

In the Wellsian Modern Utopia there are money and wages and there is a "voluntary nobility." The author cannot entirely rid himself of belief in class distinctions, although his Utopia is happily a servantless one. He divides the population into four classes, the Poietic, the Kinetic, the Dull and the Base, and apparently his voluntary nobility, the Samurai, who are the rulers, classify and legislate for the rest of the people upon that basis.

As to woman, Mr. Wells is persuaded that she is "unable" to produce as much value as a man for the same amount of work, and that "almost every point in which a woman differs from a man is an economic disadvantage to her." He believes in a woman's incapacity for great stresses of exertion, her frequent liability to slight illness, her weaker initiative, her inferior invention and resourcefulness, her relative incapacity for organisation and combination.

Mr. Wells is only willing to permit woman an equal place in society on the assumption that "motherhood is a service to the State and a legitimate claim to a living." We Communists would assure everyone a right to a living apart from specific services, but Mr. Wells has other views.

He would give the State of his Modern Utopia the right to sanction or forbid motherhood.

He proposes that every woman who is "under legitimate sanctions becoming or likely to become a mother, that is to say duly married," should have a wage to be paid by her husband and a State gratuity on the birth of her child. She will also receive from the State periodical payments so long as her child is up to the minimum standard of health and development.

Mr. Wells proposes that the State should pay "more upon the child when it rises markedly above certain minimum qualifications, mental or physical" in order to make motherhood a profession "worth following."

He would forbid the industrial employment of married women unless they are in a position to employ qualified substitutes to take care of their children.

He would make motherhood the "normal and remunerative calling for a woman" and a woman who had "borne, bred, and begun the education of eight or nine well-built, intelligent and successful sons and daughters would be an extremely prosperous person quite irrespective of the economic fortune of the man she married."

Mr. Wells adds with some caution: "She would need to be an exceptional woman and she would need to have chosen a man at least a little above the average as her partner in life, but his death, or misbehaviour or misfortunes would not ruin her." Apparently the Wellsian State would only permit the woman to bear so

many children were she exceptional and her husband above the average.

Mr. Wells adds that the man must be in receipt of an income above the minimum wage before a marriage will be sanctioned, and the prospective parents must be in good health and condition; they must possess a minimum education, the woman being at least 21 years of age and the man 26 or 27.

In the Wellsian Utopia everyone is to be registered by thumb print, and a register of his or her doings will be constantly in the making from birth till death. When two people propose to marry, each party to the marriage will be given the record of the other, including previous marriages, legally important diseases, offspring, domiciles, public appointments, registered convictions, registered assignments of property." The intending spouses, each in the absence of the other, would have to hear the record of the prospective partner read over in the presence of witnesses, after which an address of Counsel would be read. Then would occur an interval for consideration with the opportunity to withdraw from the marriage. Should the parties go forward with their project, "should they persist in their resolution," as Mr. Wells nervously puts it, then the local official must be notified and an entry made in the registers.

Should a man and woman persist in uniting in spite of the State's refusal to sanction their union, or should they do so without obtaining permission, the State, in the benevolent Utopia of Mr. Wells, will refuse the aid in maintaining the offspring that it will grant in approved cases. It will impose upon the parents a "life assurance payment" and "exact effectual guarantees against every possible evasion" of parental responsibility. Apparently the State will seize the offspring and compel the parents to maintain it, sending the parents to prison if they fail of their contribution. This is anything but utopian in our opinion. The unfit who have brought a child into the world will be sterilised.

In the case of a wife who proves unfaithful to her husband, Mr. Wells would divorce her and release both her husband and the State "from any liability for the support of her illegitimate offspring."

Mr. Wells would thus visit the alleged sins of the parents upon the children! "Even in Utopia women, at least until they become mothers, women are likely to be on the average poorer than men," says Mr. Wells. The divorced woman would thus have a struggle to maintain herself and her child.

Mr. Wells would divorce as a "public offender" a woman who was unfaithful in marriage. A husband's infidelity, on the other hand, is of no consequence to the State, he says; but he would allow the wife to terminate the marriage on that account. The old Adam is apparent here. Mr. Wells seems to forget that the husband's infidelity will take place in connection with some woman who will thereby fall under the ban of his Utopian State.

Childless marriages be would cause to lapse at the end of three or five years, but he would permit the childless spouses to re-marry each other, should they choose.

Marriage settlements and the legal liability of a husband to support a childless wife, Mr. Wells will not tolerate in his Utopia. Mr. Wells has evidently some prejudice against the childless woman, for under his rule woman Samurai who are married, must bear children — if they are to remain married as well as in the Order — before the second period for terminating a childless marriage is ex-

SHELTERED BY THE POLICE

The Secretary for Scotland said that in the two years before the War the proceedings taken to secure eviction in Glasgow were about 10,000. In 1923-4 such proceedings numbered 23,531.

The people given lodging for the night in the cells by the police on account of destitution numbered

3,664 in 1920
15,223 in 1921
54,595 in 1922
51,598 in 1923.

These reveal hideous poverty.

EVICCTIONS

Actual evictions in Glasgow numbered 996 in 1923 and 1924.

In Clydebank there have been 12 evictions this year. Proceedings were taken in 1923-4 in 613 cases in Clydebank. The population numbers 20,000.

AIR ARMAMENTS

Major General Seeley said that air raids are the most humane methods of keeping savage tribes in order. Nevertheless he would like to see an international limitation of air armaments.

INDIA

Viscount Curzon declared he valued as "one of the brightest jewels of the British Crown," but he feared the jewel is "getting a little loose in its setting." He wanted to be quite sure that the Labour Government would hold it tight. Colonel Wedgwood, now Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, had made some statements when visiting India which caused the Viscount some concern. He had said:

"The British Labour Party is with the people of India in their desire for democratic Swaraj."

"It was immaterial whether it was Home Rule or independence.

Colonel Wedgwood had been present at the Indian extremist congress at Nagpr. Seditious speeches had been made. Colonel Wedgwood had not protested, said Viscount Curzon, but Colonel Wedgwood protested that he had protested.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury had said:

COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT

Sunday, April 27th at 7.30 p.m.

ELONARD'S ACADEMY, HIGH ROAD, LEYTONSTONE.

SYLVIA PANKHURST.

Meetings.

Sundays, 3 p.m., Hyde Park. N. Smyth and others.

Sunday, April 27th, 7.30 p.m. Station Approach Bellingham. N. Smyth

IRISH WORKERS' LEAGUE

Sunday evening, 7.30; 124 Walworth Road (near Elephant). April 27th. Ed. Harby (Society of Friends' Mission to Russia) Lantern Lecture, 100 slides. Soviet Russia."

Read **EIRE** The Irish Nation

Weekly Review of Irish Republican Opinion

PRICE TWOPENCE

On Sale Saturdays

THE "ONE BIG UNION BULLETIN"

The One Big Union seeks to organise the workers on class lines. Read about it. 10/- per year; 5/- six months. Plebs Buildings, 54 Adelaide Street, Winnipeg, Canada.

"In the fight for freedom and the completest form of self-government, the democracy of Britain is wholeheartedly with the Indian Nationalists."

"British Labour had pledged itself to the application of self-determination in India."

"The whole nation was behind Gandhi." A Labour Party Manifest of February 29th last had demanded that a Commission to revise the Government of India Act should be set up forthwith, and urged that representatives of various parties in India be invited to consult with the Government to accelerate full self-government for India.

Mr. Hope Simpson (Lib.) said the Government of India Act needs altering, but the Indian Government appears to think that nothing more can be done than small repairs.

Mr. Scurr (Lab.) said that he regarded India as the Brightest jewel in the British crown and wanted it always associated with the British Crown. He wanted provincial autonomy and the right of Indians to be trained for all grades in the Army.

Certainly a luke-warm appeal from a man who calls himself a pacifist and a Socialist, and who is or has been, an official of one of the pro-Indian societies.

THE GOVERNMENT STATEMENT

Mr. Richards, Under-Secretary for India said there are many races and religions in India. Every Party in the House he was sure desires India to be a full-fledged Dominion some day, but he spoke of Democracy as something doubtful and difficult. Even in England it was not clear how it was working. The Government of India Act was an attempt to train the Indians gradually for self-government. He tried to defend the Act, but having a sorry case, made but a poor show. He wanted a "real, generous attempt" to work it. The Government was investigating the Act to see what was causing it not to work smoothly. Representative Indians who had come to the Assembly in a constitutional way would be invited to state their views.

Earl Winterton asked whether the Indians invited would be those who are prepared to co-operate with the British Government, or those who are not. Mr. Richards said plainly he meant those who are prepared to co-operate. The Government would not agree, as suggested in a Liberal amendment, to a Commission to enquire what steps are now necessary towards fulfilment of the promise of ultimate Dominion self-government.

Earl Winterton (Con.) declared himself pleased with the answer of the Government. He was glad to know that the Government intended to carry out the Government of India Act, that any enquiry the government might set up would be merely an enquiry into the working of the existing machinery, and that evidence would only be welcomed from those who are interested in seeing the Act work successfully, not from those who had obstructed it.

Colonel Wedgwood said his Government colleague had not said so much as that, but we rather fear Earl Winterton has seized the main essentials of what the Government means to do, which is in effect nothing.

The Labour Government is following in the Old imperialist tradition. Some of the Liberals are making a show of being more advanced than the Labour Government. That would be easy; but the bulk

of the Liberal Party remains as backward as ever. The Indians must look not to Parliament, but to themselves for advancement.

ler, and a former clerk in the Crown are also facing charges of larceny, one of which concerns a sum of 100,000 dollars. Simpler charges are also made against the Accountant-General of the Post Office who has escaped to Canada, whilst a former magistrate of Placentia is facing a charge of obtaining 12,000 dollars under false pretences.

THE EVICTIONS BILL

Remarkable Government Action

The Labour Government secured an amendment to the Evictions Bill of Mr. E.D. Simon, a Liberal Member, a provision which, so far from providing additional safeguards against eviction, appears to have removed a safeguard which the Bill already possessed. Apparently the Bill provided, or was intended by its promoter to provide, that a landlord who acquired a house after July 31st 1923 might not obtain possession by evicting the tenant. If the landlord acquired the house before that date, the Court might grant possession, provided it was satisfied that, having regard to the accommodation available for landlord and tenant respectively, greater hardship would be caused by refusing the order than by granting it. The Government Amendment made the possibility of obtaining an order for possession apply to landlords who bought even after the passing of the Bill. Mr. E.D. Simon stigmatised the amendment as a measure to promote the eviction of tenants. The Amendment was carried. It is difficult to understand the attitude of the Government on the matter.

THE GOVERNMENT'S HOUSING SCHEME

Everyone wants to see more houses built, but no one wants to pay for them whilst the builders, money lenders and landowners are determined to get all they can. The result is a dead-lock typical of the capitalist system. The Government is obviously reluctant to disclose the details of its scheme, lest there be an outcry from those who are expected to foot the bill. Mr. Snowden has, however, been unable to resist the temptation to disclose, something of what is contemplated to an American Journal. He has stated that there is to be an average loss of 6/- a week on the proposed houses, two-thirds of which is to be borne by the State, one-third by the local authorities. When the full burden has fallen on the local authorities fifteen years hence, Mr. Snowden estimates that it will be equal to a rate of 10d in the £. We should not be surprised were the Liberals to oppose the scheme in order to curry favour with the poorer people and ratepayers, and with those who are opposed to putting further financial burdens upon the local authorities.

Under the private property system reform that assists in some measure one section of people, always places additional burdens upon another section.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION

A blue mark in this space indicates that your subscription is now due.

The high cost of production

of the paper necessitates prompt payment.

Published by E. Sylvia Pankhurst, at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4, and printed by the Agency Press, Ltd. (T.U.), at 1, Pemberton Row, Goswell Square, London, E.C.4.