

and one saw that in the boat was a bright-eyed vivacious little woman—Toni Sender, the Editor of the Independent Socialist paper, the 'Frankfurter Volksrecht,' and one of the best known leaders of the U.S.P.D. in Frankfurt.

AN INTERVIEW WITH TONI SENDER.

Toni Sender belongs to the left wing of the Independent Socialist Party; some Communists say she is a Communist.

She received me in her office at the 'Volksrecht,' and was business-like and to the point. I asked her for her views on the present situation and the position of the various parties, and she broke into the subject at once without more ado.

She said that the enemies of the Revolution had seized the leadership, had secured the Governmental power, and had used it to turn the Revolution to the advantage of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois journal, the 'Frankfurter Zeitung,' had just eulogised Noske as one who had known how to give the right direction to the Revolution and to guide it away from dangerous tendencies.

The previous week the Noske Party had issued an appeal for unity, because the workers are leaving the Party in great numbers. But the spurious character of this appeal for unity was immediately revealed. Bernstein, one of Noske's old comrades, who like Noske had supported the war, had afterwards joined the Independents but left them when at their conference last March they had declared for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Bernstein does not approve of dictatorship: like Noske (as like Henderson and Lloyd George) and other opponents of the Soviets, he stands for "democracy." Bernstein recently formed an organisation for securing unity in the Socialist movement, desiring that all the sections should work together in harmony. Bernstein's organisation had printed a leaflet appealing for unity which contained a very mild criticism of the Government policy. But Noske allows no criticism; his minions seized the leaflet in order that it might not be circulated.

Then Toni Sender gave me a Frankfurt experience of a year ago. The Independents had issued an appeal to the workers to leave the factories and hold a meeting on the 9th of November a year ago. The Noske Party, which had formed a committee in conjunction with the Mayor and the military commander of Frankfurt, then asked the military commander to send soldiers to disperse the meeting of the Independents, and the soldiers attacked the people with their bayonets.

In order to evade the conditions of the Peace Treaty, which limits the number of the German Army, Noske has introduced militarised police. He has also organised a force called the Einwohnerwehren. These are unarmed guards who can be called up and armed on occasion. Members of the Einwohnerwehren are enrolled from amongst the landowning bourgeoisie in country districts, where the force was first formed, but now it is also being formed in the towns. Noske's excuse for thus violating the Treaty is that these extra forces are needed for preserving internal order, but the country is most orderly; the workers at present seem too tired to rebel. But evidently the explanation has satisfied the Allies, for they have not followed up their original protest. The Allies also fear internal disorder, and are anxious that Germany shall not become another Soviet Republic.

The Noske Government has also started the Technische Nothilfe, a reserve force of trained blacklegs to be called in when the workers go on strike. The force is said to have worked badly and to have done a good deal of damage during its operations, but the Government may be able to increase its efficiency. This force is a replica of the volunteers enrolled in the Winnipeg general strike and other strikes in Canada and the United States, and in Britain also during the recent railway strike. Capitalism is international in its methods. When it finds an expedient useful in

one country it speedily applies it in other lands.

In the first days of the Revolution the Arbeiterrat (the Workers' Councils or Soviets) seized the right to elect the chief of police in each district, and also a committee to act with him. The first chief of police elected in Frankfurt was a member of the Noske Party; the second an Independent—so things are moving towards the Left in Germany. (At the last meeting of the Arbeiterrat the Independent supported by the Communist representatives carried a resolution branding the Noske Social Democrats as counter-revolutionaries, whereupon the Noske Party left the Chamber.) The Independent representative on the Committee and the chief of police report that they have made no request for any of these extra forces, nor were they notified of the enrolment of the Einwohnerwehren, the operations of which (if it were to exist at all) would naturally be under their control.

Now the Government has dismissed both the Chief of the police and his Committee and has itself appointed a new Chief of police.

In Frankfurt there has as yet been little of the White terror that has reigned so fiercely in other towns. But this move of the Government is exceedingly ominous. In Frankfurt the workers have a police force of their own numbering 1,200 persons which is hated and feared by the bourgeoisie. It is thought that the intention is to dissolve this force and perhaps also the Arbeiterrat.

"But," I asked, "what are the prospects of another Revolution and how long is it to be expected that the present Government will retain its power?" Toni Sender replied that the Noske Party had greatly dwindled especially in Berlin. In the last Municipal elections it polled in some constituencies no more than 50 or 70 votes. But, as in Britain, the Trade Union Secretaries are almost all reactionaries and belong to the Noske Party; this has hitherto given that Party a certain influence over the organised workers. But this influence is waning. At the recent Congress of the Metal Workers' Union, which is the largest Union in Germany, the Party opposed to Noske was found to be in the majority.

"But what in your opinion are the prospects of Revolution?" Everyone else to whom I had put this question either spoke with dismal pessimism of a lengthy waiting, or refused to make a prophecy of any kind. But Toni Sender is an optimist; she thinks, though she admits that she cannot speak with any degree of certainty, that a revolution may come during the winter, because the shortage of food and coal may be such that the people will rebel, and only a Communist Administration will be able to face the situation. If the present Government can exist during the winter its position will be greatly strengthened.

Toni Sender emphatically insisted that the German character is not revolutionary, and that only the war, the defeat, and the belief that the Government was to blame had goaded the people to the first revolution.

I then asked whether Toni Sender thought the revolutionary feeling in the German Army and Navy, and amongst the workers, and the indiscipline arising therefrom, had been the cause of Germany's defeat in the war, or had been a large contributory cause. She said that probably the temper of the people had had some influence on the situation. There had been a revolt in the Navy 15 months before, but she did not think it could be said that revolutionary indiscipline had caused Germany's defeat in the war.

The Independents accept the Soviets and the Proletarian Dictatorship. But now I inquired more closely into the position of the Independent Socialist Party. Toni Sender assured me that it is working for revolution, and that it stands for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

during the revolutionary period, and for the abolition of Parliament and the substitution of the Soviets.

This is exceedingly important. It is generally believed in England, that of the German Parties, only the Communists, or as they are more commonly called, the Spartacists, support these principles. Toni Sender explained that the Independent Socialist Party had adopted these principles by an enormous majority at its Congress last March. She further stated that in her opinion had it been possible to hold a Congress before Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht left the Party, the majority of the Party would have been found to support their policy and the split which resulted in the formation of the Communist Party would not have taken place. Bernstein, as she had told me earlier, had left the Party at this juncture.

KAUTSKY ISOLATED.

Kautsky is also in the opposition to the majority of the Party; indeed he occupies an isolated position and the hope is freely expressed by Independents that he will leave the Party with which he no longer agrees. Kautsky opposes the idea of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Soviets; he wishes (like Noske!) to remain faithful to "democracy." The Independents who have now become the majority in the Party reply that until we have economic freedom, democracy is impossible; it is merely a phrase. The pretended democracy of bourgeois society, merely cheats and misleads the workers.

But this is Communist theory, as I pointed out to Miss Sender. She agreed with this observation: indeed she said that the programme adopted by the Independent Socialist Party at its March Congress, is practically that of the Communists.

As to the question of immediate revolution—Toni Sender had explained that she was merely expressing her own view in saying that she thinks the Revolution may come this winter, though there are others amongst her comrades who cherish the same hope. The Independents believe it useless to make isolated attempts at revolution in certain towns, as this merely gives the Government the opportunity to crush them separately. The revolutionary force must not be dissipated by sectional attempts, but must be conserved for a general effort.

Similar observations had been made to me by all the German Communists with whom I had discussed this point. Some had even said that it will not be possible to make a successful proletarian revolution in Germany till the peasant landholders are converted to Communism, and that this will be a difficult work. I put this point to Toni Sender. She replied that she did not think it possible to win all, or even the great mass of the small peasants for Communism until after the Revolution, when they would be won by the fight which the Soviet would make to dispossess the great landowners. She thought that in Germany the Revolution could, in the first instance, be mainly one of the industrial workers; the peasants would follow. In Russia, of course, the initial co-operation of the peasants had been essential. One must not even expect to win all the industrial workers until after the first act of revolution, for the more apathetic would not take part until the benefits of Communist life began to be seen in actual fact.

The sailors of the mercantile marine are, she says, very revolutionary, just as the sailors of the vanished Navy had become.

The railway workers were only allowed to form a Union on condition that that Union could not call a strike; and during the war such a Union had been formed. The railway workers are now very revolutionary, indeed they form the advance guard of the German workers. That is of immense importance, for it means a great advantage for the revolutionaries and disadvantage

for the Government in transporting food and troops.

From the discharged soldiers Toni Sender hopes little: they crave rest and peace and some of the joy of life after their horrible experiences in the trenches; they shrink from plunging again into the turmoil of warfare. "A woman can understand that," she says; "others have placed much faith in what they would do, especially the Communists, but I have never expected much from them."

I inquired of Toni Sender as to the position of the Independents concerning Parliament and Parliamentary action. In England I had heard that the Independent Party desires a dual organisation in the Socialist State—a combination of Parliament and the Soviets. She replied most emphatically that this is not so, saying that the Independents at their March Congress had clearly affirmed that the Soviets must supersede and abolish Parliament when the proletarian Revolution comes.

Toni Sender observed that Lenin, in his book replying to the renegade Kautsky, had said that the Soviet organisation is for Russia only and that each country will devise its own organ of proletarian dictatorship. "But we do not say that," declared Toni Sender, "we wish to adopt precisely the Soviet form. What other form is suggested? The critics suggest no other form, it is the form which the workers instinctively choose as soon as the Revolution breaks out: it is the form of our own German 'Arbeiterrat,' which sprang into being with the Revolution." In the meantime the Independent Party contests Parliamentary elections and considers it necessary to do so as long as Parliament exists.

That is not our position, but as I have previously stated it is the position of the majority section of the German Communists. Toni Sender observed that Radek had written from prison saying that it was ridiculous to make participation in Parliamentary elections a question of principle, it being a question merely of tactics.

On the question of industrial organisation Toni Sender asserted that the Independent position is precisely that of the majority Communists. The minority Communists desire, she said, to destroy the old Unions and to form one great Union, apparently on I.W.W. lines. The reply of the Independents and right wing Communists is: "If you wish a victorious Revolution you must bring the mass of workers with you. You must not, by attacking the existing Unions, allow the masses of more indifferent workers to become the tools of a reactionary Trade Union secretary."

I asked Toni Sender quite pointedly whether the Executive of the Independent Socialist Party is in favour of the proletarian Revolution, the Soviets and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. She replied that all the members of the Executive have declared their adherence to the March Conference decisions, though there is a right and a left wing in the Party and on the Executive.

Then I asked whether the Party would adhere to the Second or the Third International. She replied that this question is not yet settled. The Party is agreed that the Second International is dead, and she thinks that the majority does not desire to be represented there again; but some members would like to send delegates to the Second International once more, in order to condemn it. A large number of Independents desire to join the Third International and Toni Sender herself belongs to this section. The others say that the Third International has branded the Independents as traitors and that therefore they cannot go to the Third International; but must ask for a conference of the Third International and those parties in the Second International which are willing to form a new International. They argue that they do not wish to be cut off from the Western nations; apparently they ignore the fact that Italy has adhered to the Third International and they either do not know or will not admit that there are parties in France, Britain and America who have joined the Third International. They desire

they say, an International which shall be a successor to Zimmerwald and Kienthal. "But," said Toni Sender, "that is impossible, for Zimmerwald and Kienthal were merely Pacifist conferences."

Finally, I asked her: "What are the gains of the first Revolution in Germany?" She replied that all the substantial gains were secured in the first week of the Revolution, and most of these have since been lost.

"We secured the right to freedom of meeting, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press, but now we have less freedom in these respects than we had before the war. Our meetings are often prevented by the authorities; public demonstrations are very rarely permitted. Almost all the Communist newspapers have been suppressed, many of the Independent Socialist newspapers, and also the newspaper of the Socialist Youth. The offices of Socialist Parties are frequently raided.

"Domestic servants and land workers had not the rights of other workers; their conditions were almost those of the Middle Ages: a Bill of Rights was passed for them, but it has been withdrawn. An 8-hour day was adopted, but now all sorts of infringements are being introduced.

"The law militarising the labour of all workers up to 70 years of age, which had been passed during the war, which was agreed to by the Noske Party and made with its assistance, was of course repealed in the first days of revolution; but it must have disappeared with the end of the war in any case."

In fact Toni Sender assured me that the coercion of the Noske Government is much more extreme than the coercion of the old Government in peace time, and in some respects it is even more rigorous than was the Kaiser's Government in war time. The reason is obvious: Capitalism is now more alarmed about the war at home than it was either during or before the war.

Toni Sender complains that the renegade Socialists are more dangerous than the bourgeoisie because they have an intimate knowledge of the methods and organisation of the Socialists. Of course, that is why the capitalists find the renegades so useful.

It is very important that the members of the Independent Socialist Party, have been converted by the logic of events to declare in favour of the principles of Communism, and to admit, in large measure the wisdom of Communist tactics; it shows that Germany is being converted to Communism.

But whatever may be said, it seems obvious that the conversion had not taken place when Luxemburg and Liebknecht left the Party; for if those who remained in the Independent Party had then really agreed with Luxemburg and Liebknecht, they would have joined them and added their strength to the Communist forces in the moment of crisis.

In order to judge impartially Miss Toni Sender's claim that there is no essential difference between the programme of the Communist Party, and that which the Independent Socialists adopted at their last Congress in March, I asked for a copy of those resolutions. I append them here. They show that the U. S. P. is as yet committed to piece-meal reforms only. The compromise it proposes is quite untenable and thoroughly unscientific. Were the U.S.P. to possess the governing power in Germany to-day; it could not put into practice this programme; either it would move to the right or to the left. It is impossible that the state of affairs envisaged in paragraph 5 should continue to exist side by side with the Soviets and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. It is remarkable that the U. S. P. should be willing to allow banking to remain in capitalist hands, to the later stages of its Communist Revolution. Miss Sender's own comments on the policy declared in paragraph 9 will suffice to condemn it.

RESOLUTION ON THE PROGRAMME OF THE U.S.P.

In November, 1918, the workers and soldiers of Germany conquered the state power. But they did not consolidate their power, nor overcome the capitalist class domination. The leaders of the Right Wing Socialists renewed the pact with the bourgeoisie, and this jeopardised the interests of the proletariat. They carry on a confused policy with the words Democracy and Socialism. In the capitalist order of society, democratic rights are mere phantoms. As long as political freedom is not accompanied by economic freedom and independence, there is no true democracy. Socialisation, as the Right Wing Socialists carry it out, is an illusion. They are satisfied, out of consideration for capitalist interests, with a "mixed economic" management and even with "public control." The class-conscious proletariat has recognised that a war for freedom can be conducted by it alone, and not merely by the former organisations, but it is necessary to do it with a new proletarian fighting organisation, which must be established.

The proletarian revolution has created this fighting organisation in the Soviet system. It unites the working masses in their efforts for revolutionary action. It gives the proletariat the right of self-government in industry, in the municipality, and in the State. It accomplishes the transformation of the capitalist to the Socialist economic order. In all capitalist countries, the Soviet system is developing from the same economic conditions and becomes the bearer of the proletarian world revolution.

It is the urgent duty of the U.S.P. to be the banner bearer of the class-conscious proletariat in its revolutionary war for freedom. The U.S.P. stands for the Soviet system. It supports the Soviets in their struggle for economic and political power. It strives for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, for the representation of the masses as a necessary preliminary condition to the realisation of Socialism. Socialism alone can bring the removal of all class domination, the removal of every dictatorship, the real democracy. To attain this goal, the U.S.P. makes use of all political and economic means, including Parliament. It condemns all purposeless violence. Its aim is not the destruction of persons, but the overthrow of the capitalist system.

The immediate demands of the U.S.P. are:—

1. The incorporation of the Soviet system in the Government, definite co-operation of the Soviets in legislature, State and municipal administration, and industry.

2. Complete dissolution of the old army. The prompt dissolution of the mercenary army composed of volunteer corps. Disarmament of the bourgeoisie, the raising of a people's army from the ranks of the class-conscious workers, self-government in the people's army and election of the leaders by the men, the abolition of the court-martial.

3. The socialisation of all capitalist undertakings is to begin at once. It is to be carried out forthwith in the mining and power-producing industries (coal, water, power, electricity), in the concentrated iron and steel production as well as in other highly developed industries, banking and insurance systems, included. Large properties and forests are to be socialised. It is the duty of the society to bring the whole economic management to the highest efficiency by the introduction of technical and economic improvements, as well as by the advancement of the organisation to the highest pitch.

4. Magistrates and judges to be elected by the people. The immediate establishment of a State law court to try those guilty of the world war and of having hindered an early peace.

5. War-profits are to be deprived of all such fortunes by taxation. A portion of all huge fortunes is to go to the State. The remaining public expenditure is to be met by progressive increases in income, property and inheritance taxes. The War Loans are to be annulled, but indemnities should be granted to the needy, the providence societies, institutions and the municipality.

6. Social legislation to be perfected; protection and care of mothers and children, war widows, orphans and deserted are to have an assured existence, free from care. The homeless are to have homes provided by those who have superfluous rooms. Fundamentally new regulations for public health to be made.

7. The separation of Church and State and the separation of Church and school to be accomplished; public standard schools on universal lines, which shall be conducted on Socialist-pedagogical principles to be established. Every child has a right to a suitable education, and the means are to be provided for this purpose.

8. The institution of a public right of monopoly for newspaper advertisements and transference to the Communist society.

9. The establishment of friendly relations with all nations. The immediate resumption of diplomatic relations with the Russian Soviet Republic and with Poland. The re-establishment of the Workers' International on the basis of the social revolutionary policy in the spirit of the international conference of Zimmerwald and Kienthal.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

Editor: Sylvia Pankhurst

Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation.
Annual Subscription, post free—10s. 10d
Back Numbers, 4½d., post free.
MSS. should be addressed to the Editor at
400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3.
All business communications to the MANAGER
153, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.
Telephone: Central 7240.

Vol. VI. No. 38 Sat., Dec. 13th, 1919

HANDS OFF RUSSIA.

COMRADES.—

Lloyd George's statements on the intervention in Russia mean:—

1. That there is to be a long and sanguinary struggle in Russia.

2. That the British Government, with the other Allied Governments, intend to hold a conference to decide how best to attack the Soviets.

3. That an effort is to be made to secure combined action against the Soviets by all the anti-Soviet forces and to cement the differences between the Pan Russians and the various small Nationalist or Provisional capitalistic sections. It is hoped that these sections may cease disputing amongst themselves and unite to fight the Government of the Russian workers.

4. That meanwhile the boycott of Soviet Russia is to continue and trade is to be opened up with Denikin in South Russia. The territory under his domination is to be supplied with lavish supplies of any food and raw materials it may be short of and especially with manufactured articles. Denikin some time ago sent a message to the British counter-revolution that shoes and domestic utensils were more necessary to his contest in Russia than further supplies of arms.

5. In the meantime the British Army and Navy go home for the winter, as not much fighting can be done in Russia during the winter. It is too late for the Navy to make further attempts to take Petrograd this year.

We must not be too sure that the whole of the British Army and Navy is leaving at present and that neither soldiers nor sailors are remaining in South Russia. Terminological inexactitudes are so very common in the mouths of Cabinet Ministers that we cannot rely on any statements made by the Government.

6. The Government has spent nearly £100,000,000 in fighting Soviet Russia, and has rounded off the sum with a "final" £15,000,000. Does that mean "final" for this year? Or does it mean "final" till Denikin makes another appeal or "final" till he obeys the British instruction to enter into a working agreement with the other anti-Soviet forces in Russia? Or is the word "final" just a "terminological inexactitude" tacked on for the benefit of the next Labour Party Congress?

Lloyd George says he believes that the Soviets can more easily be suppressed by the tactics of intrigue, the blockade and so on than by the sword. Probably he is right; the Germans declare that it was the British blockade which caused them to lose the war. The Hungarian Soviet was overthrown mainly by the blockade and by intrigue, by the false promise that if the Communist Government and the Soviets were but replaced by a Parliamentary Socialist Government the Allies would at once make peace with Hungary, and the people would have food. The hideous White Terror and fierce reaction that followed

SOCIALISM. By G. M. Serrati.

We print with special satisfaction this brief contribution of Comrade G. M. SERRATI, Editor of the official organ of the Italian Socialist Party, the "AVANTI!" and of the fortnightly review, "COMMUNISM."

The "AVANTI!" now in its 23rd year of existence, put up a splendid fight during the war against militarism; had its offices burnt by the paid agents of Jingoism, and its Editor imprisoned for many months; printed in three editions, at Milan, Rome, and Turin, it has a circulation of over 300,000 copies daily.

It was greatly owing to the truly Socialistic and uncompromising attitude of Comrade Serrati and of his able co-adjutors, who in the dark hours of the war, when hatred amongst European nations was uppermost, kept sending forth daily messages, both of hope and of fearless criticism, that the Italian workers kept their faith in Socialism. This has been proved by the result of the recent elections, returning 156 Socialist Deputies out of a total of 508, under the clear understanding that they should not lose themselves in the quagmire of "parliamentarism," but aim straight to the goal: the overthrow of the present system.

Serrati himself refused to stand for Parliament, choosing for himself the greater freedom of his pen.

Ed. W. D.

For some time past we Italian Socialists have been the recipients of frequent and sincere congratulations. We receive them from comrades belonging to the nations that took part in the war with the imperialist coalition of the Central Empires, as well as from comrades of the Powers that were with the Entente. They all praise our straightforward and energetic attitude, holding it up as an example. These compliments, even if they might flatter the pride of some of us, cause in others, myself among them, some sad reflections.

Internationalism, both as a faith sincerely held and as a method sturdily defended, must have fallen—and still be—very low, if so much merit could and can be attributed to those who have simply remained International-

have shown how base are the intrigues of capitalism.

We are dealing with the same forces that overthrew the Hungarian Soviets. Lloyd George has plainly stated that his Government's present tactics against the Soviets are likely to prove more fatal to their existence than the warfare hitherto carried on. We must therefore re-double our efforts against the intervention.

We must demand:—

1. The recognition of the Soviet Government.

2. The immediate stoppage of any form of intervention in Russia.

3. That neither military, naval, financial aid, nor munitions, be sent to the enemies of Soviet Russia.

A rank and file conference should be held to make those demands and further, to move:—

4. A vote of censure on the Executives of the Trade Union Congress, the Triple Alliance, and the Labour Party for not having taken action to secure a general strike to stop the intervention.

5. A resolution to hold a general strike on a date decided by the conference to compel the Government to recognise Soviet Russia and to comply with the demands set out in 1, 2 and 3.

6. The election of a strike committee.

Not only should this rank and file conference be held, but the same resolutions should be moved at the Labour Party Congress itself. We call on the B.S.P. and the rebel trade and industrial unionists at the congress to do this.

S. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

alists. We have done nothing of special importance, nothing out of the way; we have only remained ourselves; not changed our colours; we have not lowered our flag.

All the past International Socialist Congresses had foreseen the possibility of a war as the outcome of the capitalistic organisation of society, of unsocial and unchecked competition, of commercial rivalry. All had denounced militarism, "colonialism," protection, which are capitalist instruments of oppression, as being the seeds of an inevitable international conflagration. All had warned the proletariat of every country against the terrible danger, and had strongly appealed to the workers not to let themselves be caught in the deadly trap of Nationalism.

Before the tragic days of August, 1914, not a single Socialist ever did consider it possible that a follower of that current of thought, which aims at the emancipation of the working class from the yoke of wage-slavery by the socialisation of wealth through the method of the class struggle, could, even for a moment, give adhesion to nationalist, jingo and warlike tactics and philosophy. We Italian Socialists have therefore only stood faithful to our past doctrine, and for this feat we have, indeed, not any great or special merit.

On the other hand, those pretended Socialists, of whatever country they be, are greatly to be blamed, who, after so many anti-capitalist and international declarations made during those years of propaganda against militarism and against war, have let themselves be swept away by the first tremor of the tempest, and have lost their reason thereby and their conscience. They, truly, have been the betrayers of the working class.

Happily for the workers, although it may be said with some truth that ideals do keep pace and progress with the footsteps of men, yet it is also true that events—in spite of the betrayal by the leaders—themselves produce the forces necessary for the triumph of the working class. When the Vanderveldes, the Thomases, the Scheidemanns, the Noskes, the Bissolatis, and the Hyndmans became betrayers, the proletariat sent forth from its own ranks the Liebknechts, the Sadouls.

Lenin repays for all and sundry traitors. Thus the sadness in our soul for so many defections disappears, overcome by the satisfaction of a duty fulfilled and by the joyous recognition that the Red Flag of class-revolution is hoisted every day higher and higher. This flag is now in the safe keeping of the strong hands of the workers. Socialism no longer is the doctrine of a few intellectual leaders.

Socialism is now the religion of the masses.

English Comrades: it is in the name of this great religion that the Italian workers, in the approaching days of Christmas, send you wholehearted greetings, full as they are of the hope that the day of redemption for us all shall not be long in coming.

EN ROUTE.

The sun goes down in softness on the hills,
And through the mist along the river road
The train rolls dreadfully, as rolls this world,
Through fainting dreams and groping veils of thought,
With bold necessity unto its doom.

MAX EASTMAN.



THE WHITE GUARD IN ITALY.

Rome, November 20th.

The Italian Socialists, in their election programme, urged the necessity, or rather the inevitability, of the use of violence in effecting the coming social revolution, thus causing no little horror to the bourgeoisie and to their comrades in other countries. The Italians pointed out that no fundamental revolution has ever yet been consummated without violence, simply because the dominant class will never release its power without attempting violent opposition. "Before it came to a peaceful transition to the Communist republic," they said, in effect, "the bourgeoisie would form their white guard, and spread the white terror. We must be prepared to defend ourselves."

As if to provide the visible demonstration of this logic, the white terror, on a small scale, was spread among the Socialists of Milan, peacefully celebrating their victory on the day after election. The terrorists, by all evidence available, were members of a semi-governmental white guard, which openly boasts of its terrorist methods against the Socialists.

The facts are these (I take them entirely from the accounts given by bourgeois newspapers):—On Monday evening, November 17th, about 8 o'clock, several thousand Socialists were celebrating their electoral victory with a demonstration in the Via San Damiano, before the offices of *Avanti*, and were being addressed by the editor, Serrati. The speech being over, the crowd peacefully proceeded on its way. In less than a minute, when it was close to the "Sirena Bridge" over the canal, a bomb exploded some sixty feet in front of the first ranks, wounded twelve persons, some of them probably fatally. If the bomb had exploded close to the oncoming parade, or a few instants later, scores of persons would have been slaughtered.

Just before the moment of the explosion three soldiers in the uniform of the "Arditi" were seen by many witnesses to deposit the bomb, and to run off by a small side street. On the following day bombs and other explosives were found in several of the various offices or club-rooms of the "Arditi," where by law (military as well as civil) they had no right to be.

Numbers of the "Arditi" were placed under arrest, including Captain Vecchi, the futurist composer Marinetti, candidate for parliament on the patriotic list, and Benito Mussolini, pro-war Socialist and editor of the social-imperialist daily *Popolo d'Italia*. Although the men who placed the bomb have not been identified, no one has disputed that they were members of the "Arditi," acting under a pre-arranged plan. *Avanti* adds that it has good reason to believe that the "Arditi" were organising an attack to destroy the offices and printing room of the Socialist newspaper on the following day, as they did last April.

And who, then, are these "Arditi"? They are the picked shock troops who served during the war, and who have now assigned to themselves the task of annihilating the Socialists as they annihilated the Austrians. Their excuse is that both are equally enemies of Italy. The undemobilised "Arditi" are stationed in Milan and other cities, but they have made themselves into a secular organisation to which demobilised members also belong. Among their officers are many of the young bloods of the bourgeoisie and petty aristocracy, who may be seen daily among the cafés and women of the Victor Emmanuel Galleries. They boast that the government unofficially recognises their anti-Socialist activities, and confers with Captain Vecchi at frequent intervals. They boasted before and after their April attack on *Avanti*. They boast now of similar things they are going to do in the future. All these boasts I have myself heard from Captain Vecchi, or from his close friends.

The "Arditi," then, are in the strictest sense a White Guard. They are permitted to continue in their terrorist activities by the Italian Government, which has taken no effective steps against them. They are clamorously and enthusiastically recognised by the bourgeoisie, which applauds each of their acts of terror. Their members possess and visibly spend considerably more money than could come to them in their pay checks. It is known that an association of employers, chiefly in Milan, contributes a million lire a month for "anti-Bolshevik propaganda," but it is not known how this money is spent. It is not known who provides the quantities of explosives and arms which the "Arditi" illegally possess and conceal in their rooms.

Now, the "Arditi" can easily be taken too seriously, in view of their ugly career of arson and assassination. They are really rather humorous young lunatics, who go into this sort of thing like young boys playing Red Indians. They tell everyone what they do, and what they intend to do, and leave their firearms around where any fool would expect to look for them. They really make it extremely difficult to protect them from the rigours of the law after an escapade like this.

But the Italian Socialists are not put off their guard by the simplicity of their adversaries. They argue that if transparent *camorra* of the military caste can exist openly in this fashion for months, with a record of violence and murder, and at a time when the revolutionary situation is by no means acute, a much more shrewd and dangerous white guard can and will be found whenever the time comes. The "Arditi" are relatively harmless because they are so open in their violence. But, say the Socialists, is there any reason to suppose that this White Guard will not become wiser and more extensive, and better organised as the nervousness of the bourgeoisie increases? Is there any reason to suppose that such an organisation will let peaceful Socialists vote the Communist republic into power, and then lay down their arms?

Frankly, the Italian Socialists are convinced that the bourgeoisie intends to be ready to use violence the moment Socialism gets control of the parliamentary machinery. If a White Guard can burn and slay in relatively peaceful times like this, and absolutely without provocation, will it wait for the counting of the votes when the crisis approaches? Well, say the Socialists, the bourgeoisie has chosen violence as it always has when its property was threatened. We should, and we certainly shall, make ready to protect ourselves against it.

—BY A CORRESPONDENT.

SOCIALISM IN SICILY.

Many legends are still told of Sicily, also many facts only too true, but enlarged and highly coloured, so that it is not difficult even to find other Italians who have not been to Sicily who tell you tales about our country to make your hair stand on end. Imagine, then, what those who live outside the confines of our nation must say! Yet even we Sicilians recognise that Sicily is very backward in things already well developed in the rest of Italy. This is due to many causes; illiteracy, above all, with its horrible consequences, which are always made worse because of the lack of transport and of communication. It unavoidably follows that the people, the workers, cannot have such an exact knowledge of life as those who live amidst the hum of machinery and big offices, which are the forges of class-consciousness and show up all the horrors of the social system of to-day. That is the reason why in Sicily Socialism has hardly any following.

But we must understand one another. To be without Socialist consciousness does not mean to be without revolutionary instincts. It is no exaggeration to say that amongst us the revolutionary tendency is inversely in proportion to the lack of Socialist consciousness; that is to say, the less there is of scientific perception of the Socialist future, the more fire in the agitation against the tyrannous system of exploitation, which here still maintains the form of a despotic rule even in the political world. One of our great Sociologists said: "In Sicily the difficulty is not to make revolutions, but how to make them stop."

Among the peasants—who make up the bulk of the population of the island—faith in the idea of a better future has made great headway. By their agricultural co-operative societies in many important centres they have freed themselves from their feudal lords. Working for half their produce (giving the other half to their feudal lord) in many places has disappeared. Some communities have been captured during the election by the peasants and Socialists, displacing the petit bourgeois from their place in public affairs, where they had only aggravated the conditions of the workers. But how many martyrs there were we need not relate!

How much blood has flowed in the streets before they gained even that much! How many apostles of the idea have fallen under the heel of the infamous bourgeoisie! The Sicilian martyrdom for the cause of redemption has no parallel.

Because the feudalists of Sicily could no longer legally withstand the wonderful awakening of the working class, which goes straight to its goal, they hire assassins who callously murder one. All our best organisers have been assassinated: Panopinto, Verre, Zangara, Rumoro! The latter was murdered a few days ago because he led the peasant strikers for the possession of the land, based on the last decree of the minister Visocchi! Let us not speak of the sanguinary death due to the "carabinieri" in defence of the landlords! A short time ago in the little place of Rizzo, about twenty peasants were killed and more than fifty were wounded. Nevertheless, the town fell into the hands of the rebels, and the authorities had to fly. It was only after a three days' siege that the troops of the bourgeoisie could enter the town, and then only after having used artillery and machine guns!

JOHN ORCEL.

Palermo, October, 1919.

Karl Marx, *The Man and His Work: Constructive Elements of Socialism*. Karl Dannenberg, Radical Review Publishing Association, New York (1/9, postage extra) from the Workers' Socialist Federation, 400, Old Ford-road, E.3. Our comrade Dannenberg, who is editor of the *Radical Review*, of New York, has given in these reprinted lectures a praiseworthy, readable summary of the life and work of him who, by his analysis of capitalist society and his discovery of the laws of social growth, did so much to bring Socialism down from the cloudland into the practical world. While himself giving vent to an eloquent appreciation of the invaluable work of Marx, Dannenberg emphasises again and again that, idolisation and reverence and lip-service to Marx and his findings are not enough; an earnest endeavour to understand them is the needed tribute. This understanding will not only give us the necessary scientific analysis of the present

upon which we have to build the future, but will enable us to reject many ideas which now masquerade as being Marxian. "The organisation of classes or circles for the study of Socialist classics should consequently be seriously taken in hand by all Socialists who have the healthy development of Marxism at heart."

In his reference to how the dismissal of Bruno Bauer from the Bonn University smashed the ambition of Marx to serve the cause of intellectual freedom as a lecturer, our author gives a parallel case in Pennsylvania, and rightly describes the Universities as being "dominated by the class interests of the bourgeoisie and everything else but agencies of free thought and investigation." His description, so far as the social sciences are concerned, holds good here in Britain also.

Not the least interesting portions of these well-printed 122 pages are those containing an admirable suggested way of approach for the student desiring to make himself acquainted with the far-reaching implications, and the new deep outlook on life contained in Socialist writings. However, as a minor criticism apart from its preface, it seems to me, that the *Critique of Political Economy* is hardly a book for beginners. Our comrade is certainly right in outlining certain historical reading and the historical chapter of *Capital* as the easier way of getting to grips later with the closer examination of economic laws in its first ten chapters. To understand social development and to view society like all else in a process of endless change is a great help to the understanding of the more abstract laws in economics proper.

When dealing with the constructive elements of Socialism our writer again emphasises that "with-out a sound knowledge of capitalist production no effective Socialist activity, economic or political, is possible." Without class-consciousness and definite ideas of the purpose and aim of working class organisation, palliatives and reforms will be sought as ends in themselves, and even the industry method of organisation will not prevent the waste of energy in not going farther than the gutteral fights.

Containing as it does much otherwise scattered information, this book will be of great service as an introduction to many needing an initial helping hand.

M. S.

THE OUTLOOK FOR COMMUNISM IN MEXICO.

INTERVENTION IN MEXICO AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

BY LINN A. E. GALE.

Editor of "Gale's Magazine," Mexico City.

There is practical unanimity among Communists, Socialists and Radicals of all descriptions in opposing intervention in Mexico. It is naturally assumed that intervention would mean war, or at least a certain amount of fighting, and Radicals know that, as always, it would be the workers who would fight, suffer and be killed—not the capitalists. But would intervention be as strongly opposed by Radicals if it did not involve bloodshed—if, for instance, it were "economic intervention" instead of military intervention and if Wall-street succeeded in making Mexico an American colony by means of financial and commercial pressure?

My answer is, unhesitatingly, Yes.

And would the effect of "economic intervention" necessarily be bad; would the eventual winning of the class struggle by the Mexican working class necessarily be delayed or made more difficult?

Again my answer is, emphatically, Yes.

The Mexican working class has nothing to gain and much to lose by intervention in any form. It makes no difference what form intervention may take. It will be intervention just the same. And the results will be equally beneficial to the Mexican proletariat whether it be accomplished by actual military conquest and annexation or by the more insidious scheme of establishing a "protectorate" as in Cuba.

The easiest way for the Mexican masses to attain industrial democracy is to keep the Mexican Government in Mexico.

The easiest way to keep the Mexican masses from industrial democracy is to rob their country of its own Government, transfer the reins of power from Mexico City to Washington, and station American soldiers throughout the land to strangle any outcry for self-determination as the English soldiers do in India, Ireland and Egypt. This is not conjecture. It is an assertion based on facts borne out by the history of practically every subjugated people, and by happenings in the last few years right here in Mexico. A local Government is certainly always more responsive to the wishes of the people than alien rule. The Mexican constitution is genuinely liberal and the administration of Carranza has probably been as liberal, all things considered, as was humanly possible in view of the difficulties, opposition and treachery under which it has laboured. With all its faults, it has certainly been more liberal than would have been the supervision of a governor appointed from the White House and independent of everybody except the American President who named him. And when the time comes for the Mexican workers actually to own and operate industry communistically, the task of supplanting the bourgeois state with a proletarian dictatorship will be far less difficult if they are dealing with a Government of their own people, than if they were ground down by the agents of a foreign imperialism.

Some there are who maintain that Mexico must become a highly developed capitalist country, more or less like the United States, before she can enter into the larger freedom of Communism. Their assumption is unsupported either by logic or evidence. Marx's theory of "increasing misery" does not necessarily mean that all peoples must experience the finality of wretchedness before they will discover what is the trouble. Some, undoubtedly, must suffer to the full the horrors of capitalism in its worst shape before sufficient class-consciousness will dawn in the minds of the workers to cause them to break their chains, but there is no reason why this should be true of all nations. Mexico does not need to pass through all the varying stages of

capitalism nor does she need to have her resources drained by exploiters before she is ready for the Co-operative Commonwealth. It is perfectly possible for her to retain her national individuality and to remain only partially developed, until there is enough solidarity among her workers, and they are well-informed enough to establish a Soviet Government. This would mean a longer period of industrial undevelopment, or what the Napoleons of finance would call ignorance and lethargy, but it would also mean less of cut-throat competition, frenzied money-making and heartless brutalities to the workers. Material progress, measured in dollars and cents, would be a little slower than some would wish, but the country would also be spared some of the nerve-racking, body-breaking and soul-killing that characterises the "business efficiency" of other nations. And when the workers came into their own, there would be vaster springs of wealth to be tapped for the benefit of all the people. More would be left for the proletariat because the capitalists had used less.

Mexico is in the making. She will not become a powerful capitalistic and imperialistic nation for a variety of reasons which will suggest themselves to the reader. She has not a chance in the world of winning at the great international game of dollars and diplomacy even if she tried—and she won't try! She has too much sense to imagine that she would stand a ghost of a show with the big finance-empires of the world even if she waited hundreds of years. Nevertheless, she is in the making, and she will do one of these two things—either become a helpless pawn in the grip of one or more of the huge imperialistic nations, or remain a nation independent politically, but backward commercially and industrially. If she becomes the former, the day of her salvation will be put off still farther and the grip of international capitalism on the world will be even more vice-like than now. If she remains the latter, her workers will have an opportunity to study, organise and prepare for the time when they will do the governing. The period of waiting will enable them to fit themselves better for their coming responsibilities. Nationalism, as a means to an end, will be a boon to the Mexican proletariat, hastening the time when the workers of the country can join hands with the workers of other countries in Proletarian Internationalism.

This will not meet with the favour of some whose dogmatism impels them to try to pound round pegs into square holes, whose blind pursuit of a general principle causes them to ignore the practical application of it. Anarcho-syndicalists will see herein a surrender to the gospel of nationalism. Sophists paid by capitalists to stir up dissension in Radical ranks will seek to arouse the antipathy of these same Anarcho-syndicalists against all who seek to save Mexico from intervention and invasion. Luis N. Morones, agent of Samuel Gompers in the recent Mexican Socialist Congress, used these very tactics, accusing me of aiding a bourgeois Government because I prefer a Carranza Government (or any other kind of a Mexican Government, for that matter) to American control here. Yet the point involved has been fully understood by all genuine authorities on Communism. Louis C. Fraina, in *Revolutionary Socialism*, page 143, says:—

"Revolutionary Socialism adopts a policy of unrelenting antagonism toward nationalism in fully developed capitalist nations (only in pre-capitalist nations that are the objectives of imperialism, such as Egypt, China and India, is nationalism progressive). The nation is an historical product, and its significance and our attitude is determined by the prevailing historical conditions. It is this circumstance that makes necessary our opposition to nationalism in highly developed imperialistic countries, and our favouring nationalism in the Revolutionary sense in the pre-capitalist countries that are the objectives of imperialism."

In Mexico nationalism points the way to partial escape from international capitalism and affords an avenue leading to international Communism. If Mexico were a great capitalist nation with colonies all over the globe, or if Mexico wanted to be such, it would be different. But Mexico is nothing of the kind, and has no such aspirations. On the contrary, she is only a young, struggling nation composed mainly of people with little education and with no desire to dominate the markets of the world. The ambition of the average Mexican is to get a good living. He knows nothing of international trade balances and cares less. His ignorance may be responsible largely for this improvidence, but educate him and you do not change him much. The Mexican psychology is not a commercial psychology. Peon and intellectual, labourer and aristocrat, despite the difference of their habits, notions of cleanliness and ideals of happiness, are essentially the same psychologically. Once in a long while you find a Mexican who thirsts for gold, but only once in a long while. Such a Mexican has probably lived in the United States or Europe or at least travelled there. The aboriginal Mexican is generous to a fault, takes no thought of the morrow, and is supremely satisfied if he has physical necessities.

Ignorance not only is bliss under certain circumstances, but it is also an accelerator in the direction of freedom. Because the native Mexican knows nothing of the wisdom of the world and counts it as folly when he is introduced to it, he is a more hopeful potential convert to Bolshevism than if he and several generations of ancestors had lived under capitalism and been saturated with the doctrine that private property, profit, rent and interest are sacred institutions and fundamental necessities.

This, then, is the particular reason why Communists ought to defend Mexico and help her retain her individuality. Mexico is not fertile soil for capitalism. The Mexicans have an inherent distrust for big business. And this distrust has grown into intense hatred in many cases because of the robbery, abuse and suffering that the Mexican masses have usually experienced at the hands of miners, oil men and other investors who have come to Mexico.

Capitalists have a keen appreciation of the situation—keener, in fact, than have some Radicals. They know that Mexico is a potential harvest-meadow for Bolshevism. Practically all the mines, factories, oil wells and banks, and even most of the stores in the country, are owned by foreigners. So when the class struggle begins to be felt, it is in 99 cases out of a 100 a struggle between Mexican labour and foreign capital. Obviously a nation of working folk, a people almost entirely levers of wood and drawers of water, is the stuff of which Soviets and Communism can be made. That the recognition of this danger to capitalism is a prime reason for the pro-intervention propaganda, may be seen with half an eye. True, capitalism needs new markets, new resources and new supplies of cheap labour, but a more impelling motive is the fear that clutches at the heart of capitalism—fear that Mexico, already the asylum of thousands of political offenders, exiles, Radicals and "slackers" may become a breeding-place of Bolshevism, from which the flames of the social revolution will creep out over the rest of America!

It will be remembered that in Russia the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, in contradiction to the Bolsheviks, did not think Russia was economically ripe for the revolution. They believed that the country must first be developed by capitalism. Subsequent events proved them to be wrong, and that the establishment of the Soviet State came easier, probably, than it would if Russia had been under

Continued on next page, col. 1.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL PROGRAMME.

The surging tide of demands from the industrial organisations of the working class grow no less in volume. From every section they are brought forward and usually without any regard for the demands of others or consideration of the ways and means of giving effect to them.

purpose. To talk of a "General Staff" and to have no definite goal other than a wilderness in which to wander is an intolerable anomaly.

Within the mining industry, there is the Sankey Report, the original demands of the Miners' Federation, the demands of the unofficial section in the South Wales coalfield: demands re Income Tax and the like.

And so we can proceed throughout the whole range of industry and find the sectionalised productions floating hither and thither. But, however much these may vary, one feature of vital significance to the future of the working class is contained in a number of the schemes I have mentioned.

THE OUTLOOK FOR COMMUNISM IN MEXICO.

Continued from page 1571.

the complex industrial conditions of some other countries. There is a slight parallel between Mexico and Russia in this regard—very slight, yet enough to warrant the assumption that it will be easier to establish Soviets in Mexico because the structure of capitalism here, which must be torn down, is so incompletely and loosely put together.

"Capitalism has now become ripe for Socialism." The words are Lenin's. He did not say ripe in the United States and not ripe in Mexico, nor ripe in England but not ripe in Japan.

The Great Change is imminent. The Revolution is almost upon us. Mexico is one of the important strategic points which capitalism wants to possess before we Bolsheviks get it.

Its duty is plain. It must organise at once for a general strike in the United States if troops are again sent into Mexico, or even if the attitude of the Government at Washington indicates that it needs an object lesson.

Intervention in Mexico must be prevented at any cost.

Mass action by American workers will prevent it, and preserve Mexico as a base for the International Proletariat.

The "Dreadnought" can be obtained from all Newsagents. If you experience any difficulty write to 152, Fleet Street.

Annual Subscription to DREADNOUGHT 10s 10d., post free.

WORKERS UNITE.

MANIFESTO.

TO THE WORKERS OF FRANCE, ENGLAND, ITALY AND AMERICA.

GREETINGS.

More than a year Russia has been shut off from the rest of the world by the Allied Governments. The hypocrisy and hate shown by the Governments of France, England, Italy and America, who fought in the war in the name of democracy and the right of all people to choose their own form of Government, is now more clearly shown in this latest most raw and deadly attempt to deny the Russian people self-determination.

The fact that the counter-revolutionary forces are getting assistance in the form of military supplies, money, food, ammunition and soldiers, is a direct violation of the democratic principles declared by your Governments, and much more so is the indirect intervention and blockade against Russia a crime, which strikes direct at innocent men, women and children.

Workers, comrades in France, England, Italy and America, friends of liberty, the right of the individual, group and nations self-determination is at stake. We come to you in the name of humanity, culture, solidarity, liberty and Revolutionary Socialism demanding that you do everything you can to stop your Governments from interfering in the internal affairs of Russia and give its people a chance to live in peace.

May you all, comrades and brothers, come to an understanding as to the methods to use in forcing your Governments to take their blood-stained hands off Russia. Give the Russian Revolution, although a more political and far from our ideal of a social revolution, a chance to develop, free from the pressure and interference of tyrannical and reactionary Governments.

Workers, proletarians, we demand that you use all your power, and through direct action, the general strike and the boycott stop your Governments from continuing their present policy of blood and iron in Russia.

We, on our part, promise to use every method at our command to blockade and boycott all Allied ships in the Swedish ports.

capitalist enterprises is deemed to be part control by the workers, when in reality, it means a combination of capitalists and trade union leaders for the exploitation of the working class.

"Control" which leaves in subjection the vast army of labour, is a snare and a veritable danger to them in their struggle towards freedom. Any organisation which can function in the everyday operations of industry. This demand for the organisation of the workers in workshops, factories, mills and mines, in yards and on railways, is recognised and perverted in the direction of the stabilisation of Capitalism.

With common objectives before the various industrial workers, with a clear recognition of what such a programme will demand, the workers can be mobilised effectively, a General Staff be formed, and the surging movements of the workers be converged towards the common good.

The Conference of January 10th and 11th, 1920, convened by the National Administrative Council of the Shop Stewards' and Workers' Committee is asked to draw up such a programme, and every committee, whether in workshop, factory, mill or mine, is invited to elect delegates, send for preliminary agenda, discuss the problems and make their proposals. No time should be wasted. Courage, initiative, audacity, clear thinking, a definite purpose—these things this hour of history demands of every member of the working class. Inertia is fatal. Inertia must not prevail.

The agenda, etc., for the Conference can be obtained from 10, Tudor Street, E.C.4.

WORKERS UNITE.

Brothers and workers of the Allied countries, let us join hands above the heads of all Governments.

Long live the international solidarity of the working class.

Long live international brotherhood.

Down with all Governments, the States, and Capitalism.

Long live free federal Communism.

The Young Socialist Party of Sweden. The Central Organisation of Swedish Workers/Syndicalist.

FREEDOM.

A Journal of Anarchist Communism.

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

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

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

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE PLEBS LEAGUE?

The December PLEBS gives some excellent reasons why all class-conscious Socialists should be in touch with "the pioneer organisation in the field of Independent Working-Class Education."

GIVE THIS PAPER TO A FRIEND.

WORKERS OF DERBY! You can get your DREADNOUGHT regularly from—

THE WORKERS' NEWS AGENCY. Clarion Club, Wardwick, Derby.

PARLIAMENT AS WE SEE IT.

DECEMBER 1ST.—Mr. Bonar Law, in reference to the punishment of the officers who had the Rev. J. O'Donnell imprisoned, remarked: "It is not usual to condemn people until they are heard!"

DECEMBER 2ND.—Mr. Hainesworth: "No passports have been issued for British subjects to travel to Soviet Russian territory, and there is no present intention of altering the Regulations under which all such applications are refused."

DECEMBER 3RD.—The widow of a private of the Black Watch is left with six children, the eldest thirteen, the youngest (twins) aged two years. Yet all a grateful country can give her is 8/3 a week pension, because the medical advisers of the Ministry of Pensions found no connection between his death in 1918 and the wounds he received in 1915.

DECEMBER 4TH.—Mr. Lloyd George told the House that the Conference on Russia, about which he spoke so confidently some weeks ago, is still uncertain as to time and place.

DECEMBER 5TH.—The Ministry of Food refused to purchase 2,000 tons of Dutch butter last week because the price asked was £26 per cwt. more than the price which the Government is paying for Danish. Why not have made up for the increase in price by allowing some of that £3,000,000 profit?

DECEMBER 6TH.—The Prime Minister stated that it was the hope of the Government to prorogue the House December 23rd, "in order to give hon. members a rest before they renew their onerous tasks next year."

DECEMBER 7TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 8TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 9TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 10TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 11TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 12TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 13TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 14TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 15TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

DECEMBER 16TH.—The House of Commons has decided to deal with the question of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

RATTLING THE SWORD.

Because the Allies accuse Germany of not carrying out the Armistice bond to the letter, a further advance into Germany has been attempted. These vanquished people must learn that they are conquered; otherwise the heroic Allies propose making war on them to teach them. Who said peace?

RUSSIA WANTS PEACE.

Araun Soviet Russia offers to negotiate with all the Allies or with any one of them. Will the T.E. Conference, sitting as we go to press, insist that the British Government makes peace now? The question of peace with Estonia will probably be decided this week at Dorpat. Workers, see to it that the whole Continent of Europe is in a peace suit, and makes peace also with Soviet Russia.

LITVINOFF'S MISSION.

The Times is trying to misinterpret the mission of Maxim Litvinoff at Copenhagen. It thinks Litvinoff merely thought of the exchange of prisoners as a ruse to get to Scandinavia. This vile misrepresentation of Bolshevik motives proves that the Times means to use every means of retarding the possibility of peace.

THE GERMAN INDEPENDENTS.

Our readers having perused the excellent articles in this issue on Socialism in Germany will appreciate the decision of the Leipzig Conference. The Independents are reported to have joined the Third International. It is to be hoped that confirmation of this will reach us in time for our next issue.

COMMUNISM IN GERMANY.

By AUGUST THALHEIMER. (A Member of THE COMMUNIST PARTY EXECUTIVE.)

At the last meeting of the German Communist Party important decisions were arrived at, which are of special interest to the development of the revolutionary movement in Western countries. On that account the development of the German Communist Party is of particular importance for western people; for not only is the activity of the German party geographically between Russia and Western Europe, but it works in a more advanced milieu than that on which the Russian Soviet Republic was founded.

Take the agrarian problem as a case in point. Our Russian comrades had to solve this question in a different manner from us, owing to political and economic differences. Great Russia, on the whole, had little to do with the problem of large estates and cultivation on a large scale, for in Russia large estates were managed on the small holding system.

The question of tactics, too, which the last Party meeting dealt with, is of central importance. The attitude of the Communist Party to Syndicalism, which has taken root in a strange way within the Party, was discussed at length. In Russia this new Syndicalism was of no importance, but France must tackle this phase, and England has similar tendencies to deal with in the I.W.W. movement.

Further points in the tactics of the party were those of parliamentary and industrial action. Both of these problems are equally vital for England, France, Italy, etc.; because with them similar circumstances to those in Germany prevail. In Russia Parliament had only had a short life, and the workers had not suffered the same bad experiences with it as did the German workers.

The Editor of "Johrsrecht" assures us that he sent his article many weeks ago, but it has not been received, possibly contributions from other comrades have also met a similar fate.

IRELAND.

A veritable reign of terror has been brought about in Ireland by Castle misrule. Yet the Westminster wisacres intend to introduce a measure in the Commons on Monday which it is imagined will find favour in Ireland. Will England ever learn?

ANOTHER NEWSPAPER STRIKE.

Madrid has followed Paris in having a strike of newspaper employees. The strike is of the most complete character possible, comprising everybody in connection with the production of a newspaper, from editors to messenger boys, and compositors to pressers, and even to the vendors, all the respective unions having united unanimously in an effort to obtain their demand of a 50 per cent. increase all round.

ARMY AND NAVY STORES.

On December 4th over 3,000 employees of the Army and Navy Stores struck work for increases in their disgracefully low wages. Owing to the coming Christmas season, the strike was patched up in two days, and the directors agreed to "National wage rates for the vehicle workers and the bakers, and the shop assistants' programme would be submitted to arbitration, awards under which in respect of wages would be made retrospective to November 1st; employees would return to work this morning (Saturday, 6th) wherever possible, and would receive a full week's wage" for this week on the basis of last week's earnings.

But, surely, these are mere promises. We hope the Government will not be too patient, and will insist on the directors carrying out these very meagre concessions.

of the first Russian Revolution, and they bore the stamp of Revolution on their brow. But in Germany trade unionism is the result of a time of political stagnation, its bureaucracy and tactics became conservative in peace time, and counter-revolutionary in the Revolution. In France, in England, and in many other western countries revolutionary workers will have the same task as German workers have in front of them: the revolutionising of the trade unions.

As for parliamentary action, the mere fact of being anti-parliamentary does not constitute Communism; it is rather the syndicalist conception. For Communists, the Party decided, parliamentary action is a question of expediency and not a fundamental problem. Syndicalists shut out any possibility of parliament being used for revolutionary ends, but the Communist Party recognises this possibility with certain reservations. The Independent Socialist Party is still undecided as to whether the workers should use Parliament on attaining power, but we Communists have made our final decision that the Soviet system is the only means of carrying out the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Another marked difference between the Communist Party and the Independent Socialist Party lies in the different idea of the form of parliamentary activity should take. The Independents favour influencing Parliament itself; the Communists only see in Parliament a means of revolutionising the masses outside of Parliament. The Communist Party of Germany is of opinion that abstention from using Parliament is only justifiable when such abstention is a signal for the decisive struggle for power.

How, then, is the counter-revolutionary trade union bureaucracy to be overcome? The Party holds the opinion that the trade unions can be made helpful in the Revolution by expelling the counter-revolutionary bureaucrats. On that account the Party considers it to be of the greatest importance for its members to pull together within the unions, and thus bring about their revolutionary advancement. But the new-Syndicalists consider the trade unions anti-revolutionary, and as such propose organising the revolutionary element within them for the industrial struggle in special workers' organisations. But the Communist Party is opposed to this idea on the ground that such outside organisations would be ineffective, and, further, that the new members of trade unions would be deprived of the influence of Communists within the unions. We feel that this problem must be solved in a similar manner in England, and also in France.

Recently a sort of National Communism has arisen in Hamburg, a group that preaches war against England, and for that end is ready to join issue with the bourgeoisie. The Communist Party of Germany thoroughly disapproves of this nationalist move, since its tactics are wholly international. The class war on international lines is the only struggle which must take precedence of the specific interests of the workers.

The class war in England is not identical in all its bearings with that of Germany, but analogies may be drawn between both countries which cannot be without use. There is naturally no question of a liberal transfer of the methods used in one country to another; but the tactics used in Germany will be modified for the particular circumstances prevalent in England, and used accordingly.

BETWEEN OURSELVES. By L. A. Motler.

Red Riot.

No doubt, Henry, you have often listened patiently to some propagandist spouting for all he was worth; and at the end you may have asked how these here Socialists mean to bring it about. As that is a question which must have occurred often to others of the Dubb family, let us have a good look at it and see what the news is going to be.

In the first place it cannot be too often explained that the how-to-do-it must be the work of the workers themselves. If it is left to leaders of any sort, it simply means leaving the people where they were, and merely putting the power in the hands of other men. Of course, these men may be honest, but they will "run things" as it strikes them best. You have only to look at the near adoption of State Capitalism (or Socialism, if you like) in Soviet Russia to see how true that is.

Now, of course, neither Lenin nor Trotsky can force Communism or any kind of advanced theory on a people who are not prepared for it. The people don't understand the subtleties of government. But, although they may be willing to let Lenin do their thinking for them, they would in the main rather "mind their own business."

It may seem a rather risky thing to let the people do things for themselves without wise men to guide them; but in the end the folly of the fool and the wisdom of the wise are generally much of a muchness. The people have to learn to look after themselves, and they cannot do it unless they find out for themselves.

Still, in a revolution, there is a state of things when those who have made the Revolution are dazed and don't know what steps to take next. It is when this thing happens that the "leader" steps in and puts a bridle on the Revolution and tries to drive it in the direction he thinks it ought to go. Once some such nobody has stepped into the seat of power which the people had emptied, the Revolution is sure to be driven

off the highway into the avenues of politics. Instead of being a Revolution for the full emancipation of the people, it becomes merely the battering ram for the achievement of the aims of a party.

The best time, then, for the people to learn how to govern themselves is here and now. They must learn to take the Revolution as a job. That is to say, the workers should say to themselves, "There are some forty millions of people in these islands; and we have factories, machinery, tools, and everything needful for producing goods, land for producing food, in short, everything we need. The problem is to find food, houses, clothes and food for these forty millions. The capitalists have failed to do it. That means that the present system has failed. Let us see if we cannot fix our minds on this task and make a good job of it."

They will at once see from the above that the first thing is to have control of the means of producing goods and food; that is, fields, factories, and workshops, as Kropotkin has it. Schemes of co-partnership, joint-control, and the like are never likely to succeed, because the "owner" insists on his "ownership." Complete control by the people is, therefore, essential.

All this, of course, means Revolution, with a capital R. It may mean bloodshed, but that will not come from the people in the first case. It will come from the "propertied class," who will have the support of the usual defenders of property—aided nowadays by tanks, armoured cars, Lewis guns, and bombing aeroplanes. The "owners" of property cannot see the justice of the case. They cannot argue, they can only shoot, hang, imprison.

Surely, no human being will deny the right of another human being to food, shelter, clothing? These are the prime necessities of life. To argue that if everybody had all three, nobody would work, is absurd. Clothes, food, and houses do not fall like manna from heaven. No work means no goods. This country is a rich

country, but there is very little of this wealth in hard cash; the wealth is produced from day to day. So the "sharing out" stunt is a footless stocking without any leg. There is no substance about it.

Appeals to the rich in the name of humanity, or even "Christian charity," won't wash. Let us remember that we have an alleged Christian religion for two thousand years; of course, there are people who will say that Christianity has never been tried, but it goes without saying that this is a "Christian country," whatever that may mean. The only thing to do is for the people simply to take over what belongs to them. They have often been assured that it is their country. They would simply be taking the ruling classes at their word.

Precisely how a revolution can come about depends on the people. If a small minority chooses a certain moment to rush it through, then that means fighting, and trusting to the people to back up the minority who are "out for revolution." On the other hand, if a good part of the people understand exactly what a Revolution amounts to, there will be very little bloodshed; certainly not much more murdering done than there is done here every day in this "Christian country" by people whom one may call "respectable Christians." Certainly, one seldom hears of a revolutionary being tried for murder.

And if there is any shooting done, it must come from the other side; and it will be done by members of the working class. It must be remembered that the police, the army, the navy, the airman, would all be producing food, or clothes, or building houses, if the capitalists did not take them away from work to protect property. Now you know who owns most of the "property"! And, further, these police are paid for by the whole people.

The "defenders of property" must be defenders of the people.

"THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM."

By DOUGLAS GOLDBRING.

One wonders why this quite interesting play was destined particularly for a "People's Theatre." From the statement of this aim, and from much of the preface, one is led to expect that the main theme will have, at any rate, some reference to the great wrong from which the "people" are suffering, and which, it is hoped, the coming revolution will destroy, namely, the economic wrong.

But the freedom for which Margaret, the heroine, fights is a personal one, the freedom from the dictatorship of family, friends and lover; and it is this motive which prompts her very sudden volte-face in exchanging Oliver (the Socialist) for Philip (the Treasury Clerk).

The constant allusion in the play to the "middle class" has little value nowadays; money, that is the ability to command the labour-power of others, is the dominant factor in present-day society, and Oliver's "twang" would be calmly swallowed in the circles where an income similar to his is a fairly average one. By the way, his somewhat canny self-congratulation on the amount he earns, compared with the wages of "the fools" he is "always girding against" sounds a rather jarring note. One is a little worried, too, in trying to understand how Eleanor Lambert earns her very comfortable "keep" in the interval of waiting for The Dawn. She is a single and still able-bodied woman, who, in a time of acute house shortage, has a home to herself in a fairly expensive locality; she can "ring for" whiskies and sodas; she has beautiful furniture, and quantities of flowers which are her principal extravagance. But her time is spent for visits and long conversations; and the only allusion to any possible work done by her is the mention of her reading of Hansard and Mrs. Lambert's vague hint of a speech at Hyde Park corner. One can of course think out a rather elaborate invention to cover the omission, but something more definite is needed in the case of a woman who is supposed to represent the most serious type of Socialist.

The characters are well drawn, and there is plenty of genuine and restrained humour in the play, although perhaps the dramatic interest is rather over-weighted with discussion and statements of opinions. One sees no reason why *The Fight for Freedom* should not take its chance in the ordinary theatre. E. L. G. Published by C. W. Daniel, Ltd., Graham House, Tudor-street, E.C.4. Cloth, 3/6; paper cover, 2/- net.

THE FUTURE OF PEACE AND WAR.

By L. TROTSKY.

IS WAR POSSIBLE IN THE FUTURE? IS NOT WAR INEVITABLE?

Quasi-erudite and profound bourgeois huffers put the question: Is war possible in the future? Is not war inevitable? And they come to the conclusion that war is inevitable.

As we know, there already exists a considerable amount of literature on this subject. But in our time the question has left the domain of literature and has been transferred to the domain of intense struggle which everywhere has assumed the character of open civil war. In Russia power has been taken over by the political party whose programme definitely and accurately describes the social-historical nature of past and present wars, whilst those conditions, under which war becomes not only unnecessary but impossible, are also definitely and accurately established. Old fashioned people, however, always like to start from the beginning, however far back that may be, and in this instance preference is given to Professor Lehr, by selecting from him, as a basis of learned reference, the commonplace banality that "struggle is the basis of life."

This aphorism, based on an infinitely wide conception of the word "struggle," simply cancels the whole of human history and merges it wholly with biology. When we speak of war, and are not playing with words, we have in view the systematic collision of State organised groups of human beings, using those technical means which lie within their reach, and fighting for aims or ideals which the State powers of those groups fix for themselves. It is perfectly clear that nothing of the kind exists anywhere outside of human society historically understood as such. If struggle is the fate of all life, then war, at any rate, is a purely historical human phenomenon; without first taking note of this fact, one cannot be said to have arrived even at the threshold of the question.

Once upon a time people devoured each other. Even to this very day cannibalism is prevalent in some places. It is true that the Ashantees do not publish journals; however, if they did, is it not probable that their theoreticians would write, "Hopes of the human race renouncing cannibalism are unfounded, as struggle is the basis of life." On this basis one might reply to the learned cannibal that which was the question was not exactly one of struggle in general, but of that particular form of it which consists in the hunting of people for their flesh.

It is a quite undisputable fact that cannibalism ceased, not owing to the influence of preaching, but owing to a change of the economic conditions of life; when it became more profitable to convert prisoners into slaves, cannibalism disappeared. But the "struggle," did not that remain? Unquestionably it did. The question with us, however, is not one of struggle in general, but of—cannibalism.

Once upon a time male fought with male for the sake of the female. Ancient bridegrooms "noticed the maidens to the river." At the present time this practice is not continued, notwithstanding that struggle is the fate of every living thing. Mutual skull-cracking in wood and cave gave way later on to Tournaments of Knights in the presence of Ladies, and to duelling. Now both tournaments and duels belong to the past, or have been converted in the majority of countries into masquerades, echoes of the olden, bloody encounters of the past. In order to understand this process it is necessary to investigate the development of things, the economic relations between men and women, the change in the clan and family, the rise and development of society, the historical limitations of the views and prejudices of knights and courtiers, the role of duels, as an element in the ideology of society, the disappearance of social standing of privileged castes, the conversion of duels into a nonsense

sical relic of the past, and so on. With the bare aphorism that "struggle is the basis of life" one will not go far in this question, as in most others.

Slave races and tribes fought against each other. The ancient Russian princes fought against each other. The same is true of various German races, and of the feudal principalities of France, that later on were to be united. The bloody civil wars of the Barons, the wars of one province against another, the towns against the troops of the knights, all this was the order of the day, not because "struggle is the basis of life," but because of the definite economic relations of the period, which disappeared together with them. The causes which led to the battles of the people of Moscow with the people of Kiev, of the Prussian with the Saxon, of the Normans against Burgundy, were at their respective historical epochs not less profound and binding than the causes which led to the last war of the Germans with the English. It would appear that the matter is not one of a general law of nature, as such, but of those specific laws which define the development of human society. Even if one does not go beyond the sphere of the most generalised historical reasoning, one may ask: "If mankind survived the wars of Burgundy with the Normans, of the Saxons with the Prussians, of the Kieff and Moscow principalities, then why should mankind not survive wars of England with Germany, of Russia with Japan?" "Struggle" in the widest sense of the word, of course, still remains, but war is a particular form of struggle which has existed only from the time when mankind started to build society and use arms. War, as one particular phenomenon of struggle, changed in accordance with the changes that took place in the forms of human nature, and given certain historical conditions, is capable of disappearing entirely.

The feudal wars, owing to their divided and scattered character, brought about a certain disconnectedness in mediæval life. One province regarded the neighbouring province as a world shut up in itself, from which much gain might be secured. Knights gazed with rapacious eyes at flourishing and wealthy towns. Later on all this changed, separate districts and provinces developed into a united whole. On this new economic basis, a united France, a united Italy, a united Germany arose, but as a result of awful internal and external struggles. Thus economic unity, by converting vast lands into one economic organism, has made wars impossible within the framework of the new, vast historical formation of the nation—the State.

But the development of economic relations does not stop here. Industry has long since penetrated beyond the national framework and connected the whole world by a chain of mutual dependence. Not only Moscow or Kiev, but France and Germany and Russia have long ceased to be self-contained worlds; they have become dependent parts of a world-wide economy. Indeed, we feel this very distinctly at present, during a time of military blockade, when we are not receiving the products of German and English industries of which we are in need. But the German and English workers feel this mechanical rupture of the economic unit no less by not receiving bread from the Don and butter from Siberia.

Production has become universal. But the appropriation of profits, that is, the right to extract the cream from universal production still remains in the hands of the bourgeois classes of the various nations. Therefore, it is necessary to seek for the roots of the present war in "nature," it is not in biological nature, nor even in human nature that one must seek, but in the social "nature" of the bourgeoisie, which has grown into a class of exploiters, of profit-makers, of robbers and

despots, who compel the working classes to fight for it. Universal production united into a whole creates unimaginable sources of wealth and power. The bourgeoisie of every nation grasps at these sources, thereby disorganising universal production in exactly the same manner as the feudal barons, during a period of transition to the new stage, interfered with national production.

The class which doomed to interfere and destroy production cannot for long maintain itself in power. It is for this very reason that the bourgeoisie feel themselves obliged to search for a way out by creating the "League of Nations." Wilson's idea consists in a united universal production, which one may regard as a partnership of thieves, in which profits are to be divided amongst the capitalists of all lands without war. Naturally, Wilson is inclined to keep all he can for his New York and Chicago stock-brokers, while the thieves in London, Paris, Tokio and elsewhere are not agreed on this.

The difficulty of the bourgeois Governments in deciding the question of the "League of Nations" arises from the conflict of bourgeois appetites. Nevertheless, one may say with certainty, after the experiences of the present war, that the capitalist classes of the most important countries will create conditions for a more or less united, centralised exploitation of the two hemispheres without war, similar to the manner in which the bourgeoisie liquidated the feudal wars within the bounds of national territory. The bourgeoisie, however, will only be able to decide this question in the event of the working classes not opposing it. In the same way as in former times the working classes rose against feudalism. The significance of civil war, which in Russia has ended with the victory of the proletariat, and which is nearing the same end in all other countries, comes to this: that the working class takes into its own hand the solution of the problem which now stands before the whole of mankind, and is a matter of life and death, namely, converting the whole surface of the earth, the mines and everything produced, by the labour of men, into one systematised universal production, where the distribution of products will be regulated as one big general bank.

The learned bourgeois base the inevitability of war until doomsday upon the rickety conclusion of old State jurists. They point out that right, "the principle of nationality," and political equilibrium cannot save the world from war. Right based on the belief in the immutability of all class, caste and national refuse that was ever collected on the face of the earth. To occupy oneself in proving that recognition of the divine rights of the Romanoffs or the Hohenzollerns or powers of the Paris money-lenders will not safeguard us from war is in reality only wasting one's time with profound prattle. The same applies, of course, to the theory of the so-called "political equilibrium." Marxism (Communism) has revealed better than anything else the delusive and specious character of this theory. Diplomatic trickery about "political equilibrium" was merely a screen with which to conceal the diabolic competition in the development of the military machine, on the one hand, and on the other, the endeavours of England to counter-balance France by Germany and Germany by France.

The theory of an armed peace by means of "European equilibrium" can be likened to two engines on the same rails rushing towards each other—a theory which Marxists laid bare in all its falsehood long before it collapsed, covered with blood and mud.

Only petty-bourgeois dreamers, or bourgeois charlatans are capable of taking the principle of nationality as a basis for permanent peace. Wars were conducted under the banner of nationalism at a time when industrial development needed a transition from the provincial to a wider national-State basis. Modern wars have nothing to do with the national prin-

Continued on back page.

WATSON RELEASED.

W. F. WATSON'S DEFENCE.

A welcome to W. F. Watson, who was released on December 5th from Pentonville, was given at the International Socialist Club, 28, East-road, City-road, on Sunday, December 7th, thus affording him an opportunity of making his defence. The hall was packed. W. F. Watson referred to a number of leaders who had been accused of being in the pay of the enemy, and said it was part of the capitalist plan to undermine the workers' organisations by spreading such reports. "Even suppose Watson were guilty, what would that prove? That we have an unscrupulous Government to deal with." He said he was very glad he had been to Pentonville, as it proved that he had been of no use to the Government. He said he did not consider that he had done anything foolish, as it was all part of a pre-conceived plan, though in one or two details he may not have acted wisely. If he had not led the police up the garden there would never have been the dinner at the Bell Holborn, the Hands Off Russia Conference, or the Holborn Empire meeting, and, therefore, the Hands off Russia movement would not have been where it is to-day. "I did accept money from Scotland Yard. I admit it, and I have never denied it. A comrade said to me if you can explain what you did with the money they would be satisfied. I do not believe anyone would be satisfied. If I did spend it on beer and whisky, what of it? I was not short of money at the time. I flatly deny, and challenge the whole of Scotland Yard and the Government to prove that I gave them any information." Some say, "Why did you even entertain the idea of being in the pay of Scotland Yard?" "Those of you who are in close touch with me know that I have always taken up the attitude that the end justifies the means. The thought that determined my action was this. I was President of the London Workers' Committee, and the most active man in the Hands off Russia movement. I wanted to do what Lenin and Trotsky wanted us to do, to keep the capitalist class so busy here that they would not have time to worry Russia. I said to myself, 'You know what you are doing, you have a certain amount of power over yourself, if you turn the police down they will go to someone else.' But whilst they thought Watson was giving them information they did not approach anyone else. I had to send them something, and I have sent a comrade one of the screeds I sent them, and often I sent them information of meetings which reached them twenty-four hours after they had taken place; therefore, I was able to carry the Russian movement to where it is at the present time."

He said that he had taken several into his confidence who knew what he was doing all the time. They did not ask to see the reports to Scotland Yard because they had confidence in him. Why were they chiding him now? He asked what difference it would have made if he had kept copies, as they do not trust him. "You are not going to convert people to the Revolution through the integrity of individuals." "I am prepared in the interests of the working-class movement, to make any sacrifices, rather than sell my soul to Lloyd George or any other organisation. There is not sufficient

money in the whole world to buy the soul of Watson. There are hundreds of others who cannot be bought."

"I have told you exactly what I have done. I am not ashamed of what I have done, and I was not foolish when I did it. There is only one weak link in the chain, that I did not get a committee formed and place the whole thing in their hands. There are arguments in favour of it and against it. If I had got a reliable committee together it would have been better. But you cannot always get a reliable committee. There are members on a committee that can be approached. The investigation committee throws all the blame upon Billy Watson, and they have done right, and I am glad." He said he would continue fighting in the revolutionary movement. When he had had time to go through cuttings and to see how the revolutionary movement had progressed, he would prepare a statement and send it to Scotland Yard. He was convinced that the revolutionary movement had gone on by leaps and bounds, and was far more powerful than before he went into prison.

Many questions were asked. Among them:—"Who found him out?" He replied that he admitted it at the Sessions, and gave Scotland Yard the opening to prove that he was correct.

Watson said that he was not an *agent provocateur*, that they were paid to stir up revolutionary feelings. A Scotland Yard man had been to him and had implored him not to make such inflammatory speeches, they did not want trouble stirred up. He was running the risk of being repudiated by his comrades, he knew this would happen. He received £3 a week, and signed a typed scrap of paper as a receipt.

There was a good deal of heckling, and one well-known comrade asked if they never made mistakes themselves, and what qualifications they had to decide how anyone else should act?

"Why did not the Investigation Committee make a report?" Watson replied: "It came to the conclusion that as I had not placed myself in the hands of a committee I must bear the whole brunt of it."

When asked who the comrades were in whom he had confided, Watson loyally refused to give their names, but not one of them had the courage to come forward and stand by him. He said that he was quite prepared to go before the investigation committee on Tuesday night.

In this instance no one had been able to prove that W. F. Watson gave anything away to the police; no one has suffered through his taking money from the police, unless it may be himself. He is certainly going through the mill now with a certain section. Many of us do not approve of having any transactions with the police, but if Watson did it because he thought it was right and in the interests of the movement at the time, we ought to take that motive into consideration in passing judgment upon him. We must beware of playing into the capitalists' hands by making splits in our own movement; by so doing we may do the movement infinitely more harm than ever Watson has done, but we shall not have to go through the mill for it. Let us sink personalities and take a broader view, and concentrate on working in the movement and for the movement.

N. S.

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

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

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

LONDON MEETINGS—OUTDOOR.

Friday, Dec. 12th. 7.30 p.m.—The Square, Woolwich. Melvina Walker.
Saturday, Dec. 13th. Great Push for Communism and against Conscription and Intervention in Russia, in the S.E. District. Meetings at 3 p.m., at the Triangle, Peckham, and at 7 p.m. in the Lewisham Market Place. Speakers: Minnie Birch, Melvina Walker, P. A. Edmunds.
Sunday, Dec. 14th 11.45 a.m.—Osborn Street, White-chapel, Melvina Walker.
Friday, Dec. 19th. 7.30 p.m.—Lesbia Rd., Hackney. Melvina Walker.
Saturday, Dec. 20th. Great Push in Waterloo Rd.

INDOOR.

Sunday, Dec. 14th. 7.30 p.m.—20, Railway Street, Poplar. W. H. Cousins. Chair: Melvina Walker. (See advert.)
Monday, Dec. 15th. 7.30 p.m.—20, Railway Street Poplar. W.S.F. Business Meeting.
8.30 p.m. W. S. F. Reading Circle.
Thursday, Dec. 18th. 8 p.m.—20, Railway Street. Mark Starr. Seventh Lecture on Industrial History, (The Renaissance).
Friday, Dec. 19th. 7—10 p.m.—400, Old Ford Road. Dancing.

Notice.

The Lectures on Industrial History at 20, Railway Street will be resumed after the Xmas Holidays on Thursday, Jan. 8th, 1920.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS.

EAST LONDON WORKERS' COMMITTEE.
Sunday, Dec. 14th. 12 noon—Victoria Park. Walter Ponder and others.
Tuesday, Dec. 16th. Queen's Road, Dalston Lane—7.30 p.m.; Walter Ponder and others.
Thursday, Dec. 18th. 7.30 p.m.—400, Old Ford Rd. E.3. Business Meeting.

WALTHAMSTOW, LEAGUE OF RIGHTS.

Tuesday, Dec. 16th. 3 p.m.—William Morris Hall, Somers Road. Melvina Walker.

EAST HAM LEAGUE OF RIGHTS.

Tuesday, Dec. 16th. 8 p.m.—Old Public Offices, Wakefield Rd. W. H. Cousins. "Morality."

INTERNATIONAL FAIR.

Full report of the Fair, together with balance sheet, will appear in our next issue.

THE FUTURE OF PEACE AND WAR.
Continued from page 1515.

We will say nothing whatever about civil war. Koltchak sells Siberia to America, Denikin is ready to enslave three-fourths of the Russian people to England and France, only in order to reserve for himself the possibility of exploiting the remaining fourth. International wars also have nothing to do with the national principle. England and France share German colonies between them and despoil Asia. America thrusts its paw into European affairs. Italy takes possession of neighbouring Slavs. Even the semi-strangled Serbia starts to throttle the Bulgarians. The national principle here, even in the best of cases, is no more than a—pretext. The matter is one of universal power, of the domination of the industry of the whole world. Meanwhile the fate of war is being decided in a very practical manner. By thrusting the bourgeoisie away from the helm of State by taking power into its own hands, the working class is preparing for the creation of a Federative Soviet Republic of Europe and the whole world on the basis of United World Economy.

War was and will remain a form of armed exploitation or armed struggle against exploitation. The federal domination of the proletariat, as a transition to universal Communism, stands for the abolition of exploitation of one man by another, and consequently of armed conflict between man and man. War will disappear in the same way as cannibalism disappeared. Struggle will remain, but it will be the collective struggle of humanity against the hostile forces of nature.

POEMS

JUST OUT!
A most effective
Gift Book.

By L. A. Motler

Printed on Antique Paper, 32pp. Quarto.
In Art Covers, silk cord. 1/3 post free.

Also—"Liberty through Anarchist-Communism," by H. Oakley, 1d. "Anarchist-Communism in plain English," by L. A. Motler, 1d. "The New Anarchism," by L. A. Motler, 2s. per 100. Order from the Secretary, 47, Crowndale Road, London, N.W.1

PAMPHLETS FOR COMMUNISTS!

Russian Soviet Constitution — 3d. post free
A Year in Soviet Russia — 2d. "
The Socialist Soviet Republic of
Russia: its Rise and Organisation,
by Captain Jacques Sadoul — 2d. "

Full list on application.
Reduced rates for quantities.THE PEOPLE'S RUSSIAN INFORMATION BUREAU,
152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

W.S.F. MEETING

at 20, RAILWAY STREET, POPLAR on
Sunday, Dec. 14th, 7.30 p.m.

W. H. COUSENS: "Marx and Bakunin."
Chair: Melvina Walker.

Discussion Invited. Silver Collection.

MISCELLANEOUS ADVERTISEMENTS.

Classified advertisements: One penny per word
Displayed advertisements: 7s. 6d. per inch.
Pre-pay and send to Manager, "Workers'
Dreadnought," 152, Fleet Street, E.C.4.

READ

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

FAMILY LIMITATION DOCTRINE. Post free, 13d.—
Malthusian League, 48, Broadway, Westminster

Communist, 20, seeks part-time sedentary employment; also quiet room. Box (90)

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

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