Wireless Telegraphy in Russia.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. VIII. No. 12. SATURDAY, JUNE 4th, 1921. [WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

PRISON LIFE.

By SYLVIA PANKHURST

It is a strange contrast to go from Communist Russia, the highest point yet reached in civilisation, to Holloway Prison, where one comes in contact with some of the saddest miseries resulting from the capitalist system in directive centres of the largest and most powerful empire in the world. A term in prison has always meant to me a renewed spur to work for the overthrow of the hideous conditions of which prisons are a part.

When I first went to Holloway as a "hard labour" prisoner in 1906 for being a Suffragette, I passed, as number 12, through the hard mill of the ordinary prison treatment of those days, eating the oatmeal gruel and bread which then formed the greater part of the diet, sleeping on the wooden plank with the small and strangely hard herb-filled mattress and pillow, which still survive. "Don't look about you 12!" was the constant admonition I got as I passed with the line of women to chapel each morning, or into the exercise yard for half-an-hour once in three days. But I did look about me, and as the result of what I and others saw there, an agitation grew up which resulted in some minor amelioration of conditions for the ordinary prisoners. This agitation, when intensified by the hunger strike, secured also improved conditions for the political prisoners. In 1910 Parliament approved the making of rule 243a, under which political prisoners became entitled to have their own food sent into them from outside, to wear their own clothes, to receive a letter and a visit once a week, to have daily newspapers, as well as their own books, and writing materials, to write what they pleased during their imprisonment, and to take this out with them on the expiration of their sentence.

The very modest rights granted by rule 243a were much smaller than those accorded to political prisoners in some other countries, and to W. T. Stead and others imprisoned here in the days of our fathers. These rights were wrung from the Asquith Government after a hard struggle. The Lloyd George Government has taken them away.

It is rumoured that ameliorations established for the general body of prisoners are also to be withdrawn, and that the Home Office wishes to "cut out Reform," to abolish the hospitals, and make other changes of which I shall write later.

When I went to prison on this occasion I did not know whether rule 243a was to be granted to me. I addressed a petition to the Home Office for the rights granted under this rule, and received a negative reply. It was known to the authorities by medical evidence produced at my trial that I had collitis and other chronic ailments, and in my petition I referred to this, but even the request for the food which might have minimised the injury to my health, which must inevitably result from six months' imprisonment, was denied.

What I felt much more keenly was being deprived of writing materials and the opportunities of study and intercourse with current thought, which rule 243a would have afforded me.

Those who have not been in prison will not realise that I and the many other political prisoners, in common with all the



TO FIGHT AGAIN!
Comrade Sylvia Pankhurst.

thousands of other unfortunates who fill the prisons of this country, are obliged every alternate week, on some unknown day, to submit to the indignity of a "general search," the prisoner's person and cell being simultaneously searched by the officers to see whether they may have in their possession anything they are not allowed to have. Prisoners are punished if they are found to have a pencil or any other such forbidden article, to be wearing more than the regulation number of prison garments, or to have more than the regulation amount of the inadequate bed covering under which they shiver in the cold winter nights, or to have exchanged a library book with a neighbouring prisoner, when both had read their books before the day for book-changing had come round. The last is a very common "offence," a pathetic circumstance. It is indeed cruel that the craving for mental occupation felt by these captives, a large proportion of whom have always been denied opportunities for study, should thus be crushed. Third Division prisoners—and the great mass of prisoners, remember, are in the Third Division—are granted books from the prison library when the first month of the sentence has expired. Then they may have two "library books" every three weeks. Second Division prisoners have their "library" books changed each book, their educational books once a fortnight. Educational books, according to the rule card, include "all books of general interest other than novels and magazines." A large proportion of the educational books are small quarto volumes of a hundred or two hundred pages in these little scrappy book series which pretend to give a superficial knowledge to the million as it were in tabloid form. Such books, read in a few hours at most, do not deserve to be read several times in succession!

Many women expressed to me their loathing of the "general search." "It degrades you so!" said a hard-working mother of seven, nursing her three months old baby, and serving her first offence. The prisoners are supposed to undress and hand their garments to the officer. The officers pull the coverings off the bed and search every corner of the cell. It is an unpleasant ordeal for them, as well as for the women who have to submit to it.

Even those reformists who imagine that they can do all that seems to them necessary in the way of improving the ordinary human lot within the capitalist system, should surely realise that it is a peculiarly gross scandal that Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Shortt, and the other members of the Coalition Government should be able thus to misuse and insult their political opponents.

What would have been said of the Russian Communist Government if the British and other Allied counter-revolutionaries, as well as the Russians of that brand, imprisoned in Red Russia, had been subjected to the indignities heaped upon me and my fellow Communists? (The Irish have had to endure the same conditions.) We know that those counter-revolutionaries imprisoned in Russia, loud though their complaints have been, were allowed to receive visits freely and to have food and comforts supplied to them in prison by friends and sympathisers. In this, as in every other respect the White Terror which is used in the effort to stop progress, is infinitely more severe than the Red Terror used to maintain the liberties of the masses against the selfish reactionaries, who would re-establish the cruelties and tyrannies of capitalism.

The odious "general search" was perhaps not in force when we were going to prison between 1905 and 1914; certainly I never heard of it. The search on entering the prison was greatly resented by the political prisoners of that period, and the old Suffragettes and their friends will remember that they thought 6 weeks a terribly long sentence in those days! To-day we Communists get six months for a speech or an article to which the authorities object. But those who stood up for political liberty and free speech when Suffragettes were burning buildings seem to be deaf and blind to what is in progress! Was it only the glamour of Albert Hall meetings and smartly-dressed ladies of the middle and upper classes which caused this fervour which was supposed to be animated solely by the love of political liberty? Do the liberty-loving Reformists forget that these monstrous sentences are still being imposed under the ill-omened Defence of the Realm Act, which was rushed into law under the pretence that it was merely to safeguard the country from foreign invasion.

When I entered Holloway as a Second Division prisoner last November, I was provided with the dietary which has replaced the one time "skilly" and bread of the Third Division and the old Second Division diet, and which is now supplied to all prisoners not in hospital. This is as follows:—

Breakfast.—Porridge without milk or sugar, and bread with a tiny scrap of margarine.

Dinner.—Two days a week dried beans, boiled, with about an inch of bacon fat, and potatoes (oh, what potatoes!); 2 days fish (of the horrible fish I shall have more to say presently), and potatoes; one day soup; one day stewed meat; one day pressed beef (the meat is in very small quantities and what a quality!); supper (or tea if you prefer to call it so; it is at 4 p.m.), cocoa

(Comrades, you would not like *that* cocoa!), dried beans and bread five days a week; one day tea and bread and a small piece of cheese.

I could not digest such food in my then state of health, and the time I had of it before I decided to appeal against my sentence made me quite ill. I contend that it is a highly unsuitable diet for people kept in confinement, and it is a painfully low one for anyone who has to work so hard as those of the prisoners who are employed as cleaners and stokers in the prison. Women whose children are born in prison are put on this diet and sleep on the plank beds in the ordinary cells a month after the birth of the child. Expectant mothers are also kept thus until the latter part of their pregnancy. There are women suckling their babies at 8 p.m. whose last nourishment for the day is at 4 p.m.

I was out on bail whilst awaiting my appeal, and when it was refused and I returned to prison on January 5th, I was at once put into hospital where I saw for the first time nurses in prison. There were none in the prison hospital up to the time of my last release in the summer of 1914. I had always advocated their introduction into the prison hospitals as an elementary necessity of hospital management. The officers always treated me with the utmost kindness, and I have none but grateful remembrances of them. My feelings towards the nurses and officers are equally cordial. As a matter of principle, however, I should have thought that every humanely-disposed person would agree that there should be none but nurses in the hospital. To be ill for months at a time in a narrow prison cell, quite cut off from one's home and family, and from the outer world, always seeing those mildew-coloured faded dirty green walls and that door with its spy-hole, should be punishment enough to satisfy the most vindictive judge or magistrate, without any further intensification of the prison atmosphere—without the "general search," and so on.

The hospital dietary is as follows :—

Breakfast.—Bread, a tiny bit of margarine, porridge, tea, or milk if the doctor orders it.

Dinner.—Stewed meat four days, fish two days, potatoes, milk pudding.

Supper.—Bread and a bit of margarine, and tea, cocoa, or bread, as the doctor may order it.

Some prisoners have fish every day, and nursing mothers and other patients have a pint of milk extra if the doctor orders it, or, if the doctor orders it, Benger's or Allenbury's food and Bovril. These extras are obtained mainly by the prisoners worrying the doctor persistently, in which case she may get the extra food if she is losing weight. Patient people who do not press energetically for extras do not get them.

The food is anything but tempting, the "hot" milk in the pint mugs is often only lukewarm, and is often sour in the depths of winter. Why is this? Are the utensils unclean? Is the place where the milk is kept unsuitable? Does the milkman supply inferior milk? These are the questions all the prisoners ask. The meat is nasty; it comes round in dingy tins and has often a rainbow-coloured shine that would make anyone outside prison refuse to eat it. Why is the meat so bad; we all ask that. The potatoes, too, are badly cooked, and are usually very bad potatoes, often half black.

But it is the fish—and some prisoners get it every day—of which all complain most. We smell it as it comes down the corridor. White fish is often a deep brown colour. It seems to have been only half cooked, then taken out of the boiler or steamer and put in the tins on the top of the stove to keep hot for a long time, so that when it reaches the prisoner it is dried up and sticks to the tin and, as one tears it off, it breaks in bits. Mackerel we had very often. I never realised before that a fish had so large a supply of internal organs: it seemed that it had not been cleaned as it should be. The rule card states that prisoners who are dissatisfied with their food may complain immediately after the meal, but frivolous complaints will be punished. I have known prisoners refuse their fish and ask to have it shown to the doctor again and again without being supplied with anything in its place. In spite of the frequent complaints the fish continues bad. Who is to blame? Where does Holloway prison do its shopping?

Rather more than a month before the end of my sentence I was having long attacks of pain after every meal, until the pain became almost continuous. One day I was feeling very poorly when mackerel was brought round. I pointed out to the officer that the fish was all streaked with purplish blood and looked most revolting. "Why is it like that?" I asked. She said "I couldn't eat it: would you like me to show it to the doctor?" I agreed; in any case I felt too ill to eat it. The lady superintendent passed round immediately afterwards. She came to me and said she was sorry. I said: "The fish is hardly ever fit to eat in here." She said: "I have never heard anything about it!" Of course I told her that I had told the doctor many, many times of it, and that I knew that other prisoners were constantly complaining—that, in fact, the matter was a by-word amongst the prisoners. I was asked if I would like to have something instead of the fish—as I have said, I was well treated.

As of old, one still has the piece of tin instead of a knife; one is without a fork, but one has a spoon—a metal one instead of the old wooden germ-carrier. So slowly moves Reform! Oh, boasted humanitarianism of this twentieth century! Prisoners are supposed to have one enamelled plate in the cell. The pudding, nearly cold when it comes as a rule, is put in one of the pint mugs by the officer, who doles it out of the large basin that she brings round. The quantities of food are very irregular; sometimes it is only a tiny bit of fish or meat, sometimes double or treble the quantity—it is just a matter of chance. Like Oliver Twist's companions, one doesn't ask for more.

No one eats, no one sleeps the first month in prison. The prisoners throw their food to the pigeons, and the prison yards and roofs are thronged with birds. Blackbirds and thrushes sang all day by my window. I listened in the earliest dawn to the chirping of little songsters who seemed to wanton in ecstatic joy when the risen sun at last flooded the sky with radiant light. My little window, showing that patch of sky across which the cloud shapes sailed so gorgeously, marred though you were by those ugly bars, and you blithe little birds, how you helped me through those long, grey months! But except in the hospital, the cells have small-barred panes of dull glass, through which one could not see the cloud-shapes, and from some cells one sees only grey walls and not a glimpse of sky. During the first two weeks of my imprisonment, I was in a cell with one of those dull, small-paned windows, and it was so cold that on one occasion the thermometer was only 43 degrees in my cell. There are many nursing mothers in that part of the prison. I was put there because the hospital was full; it is an old part of the prison, and should be pulled down.

The clothing is fantastically unlike anything one wears outside, and many women are distressed by that. Worse still, it is difficult to get changes. I never went more than a fortnight without a change of all my undergarments, but I had to agitate for changes, and I know that many in hospital were less fortunate. In the prison itself it is a common thing, the women say, to go five weeks without a change of clothing. I heard a cleaner complain to one of the officers as she was crossing the yard that she had not had a change of stockings for six weeks. I often saw women and babies wearing broken boots.

The lady superintendent told me that venereal disease is rife in the prison. I said: "Yes, I am afraid of that." She said: "Oh, we take precautions." But what are those precautions? The bath is not disinfected or scrubbed after one prisoner uses it and before another steps into it. The entrance examination is quite cursory; at least in most cases. I, on several occasions, refused clothing which, though it had been washed, was less than half clean, and still bore stains left by the last wearer.

A woman just sentenced for selling cocaine, whose husband was also newly imprisoned for the same offence, was informed that her husband was ill and not expected to recover. Her petition to be taken to his bedside was refused. A mother imprisoned for four months for stealing some trifle had served half her sentence when she was informed that her little child of seven was not expected to live, and that she was being operated upon. She could not go to see the child, and piteously wailed that it would have been kinder not to tell her.

I met in prison a little girl of sixteen years, whose crime was kicking a policeman who had arrested her sister, a girl not much older, for some trifling offence. This child had been kept in the remand prison for a month, then she was sentenced to two, in default of sureties of £40. Her mother was a working woman, unable to find that sum.

(To be continued.)

AN APPRECIATION.

Dear Comrades,

I am sure our readers will join with me in appreciation of the splendid way in which those who have carried on the *Dreadnought* during my absence have done their work. On my return I have received letters from Britain and abroad bearing congratulatory testimony to the high Communist standard which the paper has maintained.

I want, too, to thank you all for the cordial welcome that you have given to me on my release. I want to tell you that, in those moments of despondency from which you and I and all who are fighting in the uphill struggle of progress at times suffer, your generous appreciation and warm tokens of affection give me renewed courage.

I have come out of Holloway with my mind brimming with ideas; in fact, I see a host of unworked fields of propaganda and research which I am confident will yield splendid treasures of impetus to our movement.

Now for the energy and resources to work them! With faith and goodwill these will be found.

How glad I am to be free. How glad I am to join you in the great struggle, and as you build, Comrades, "we few, we happy few, we band of brothers," soon to be few no longer, to join you in building too my little bit of the Red International.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

INDUSTRIAL JOTTINGS. By WARD NEWTON.

The Mining Dispute.

After nine weeks' solidarity on the part of the miners, the Government have at last decided on another attempt to bring the dispute to a decision. Arbitration on specific points is involved in the Government's ultimatum, and the Miners' Executive have been informed that unless they can agree with the owners on the basis of the settlement suggested the Government will introduce legislation to compel a settlement by reference to an arbitration tribunal. The amount of district wages, it is suggested, and the proportion of profits to wages is to be decided by either a National Wages Board or a tribunal of three or a single arbitrator. The most remarkable and significant feature of the Government's proposals is the deliberate ignoring of the principal issue of the dispute, namely, the national scheme of settlement and the pool.

This seems to me to be a deliberate challenge to the miners on the main issue for which they are fighting, and under the guise of being a fair and impartial method is really a coup by which the Government hopes to turn the miners from their main demands. No doubt, in the event of refusal by the miners to agree to the Government's scheme, placards will again be posted up with Government propaganda declaring that the miners have deliberately refused a fair and impartial treatment of the dispute. It remains to be seen whether the miners will fall into the trap.

Cotton Trade Wages.

The ballot of the Operative Cotton Spinners' Amalgamation on the wages question shows 95½ per cent. accepting the employers' proposal for a 30 per cent. decrease. The Negotiating Committee, consisting of eight representatives from each side, are to meet, and failing an agreement, the mills will close on Saturday. Half a million operatives are involved.

Shop Assistants, Warehousemen and Clerks.

The financial report of this Union for the March quarter show an increase in the accumulated funds of £11,000. Notwithstanding the exceptional strain upon the Union's funds caused by the present industrial position, the finances have been steadily improving.

Tribute to the Miners.

"The Record" (United Vehicle Workers) says of the miners:—

"They are not men, they are supermen. For the last two years they have been knocked about, and stopping sledge-hammer blows all over the shop. For two years prior to the lock-out, their week's work averaged about four days, but when the call came there was no complaint, no miserable wail about strike pay—they simply fell into line.

"A few weeks ago we had a letter from a comrade in Ystrad, Rhondda. Not a long letter, nor was it a literary masterpiece. He simply said: 'We were hungry when we came out, we are hungry now, but there's grass on the mountains, and we'll eat that before we give in.'

"Therein is expressed the spirit of the Welsh miners. It is unconquerable. It is the spirit that will win the final battle in the class struggle."

To those workers and Trade Union leaders who are still unconvinced of the necessity for "the strike to end all strikes," the present mining dispute should be a good object lesson. While the miners are holding out gallantly in the ninth week with no prospects of a satisfactory solution yet in sight, trade is getting worse, unemployment is increasing by leaps and bounds, and it looks as if in place of the general strike threatened by the Triple Alliance and so basely betrayed, the masters will soon have turned the tables and declared a general lock-out. There may be some optimists who believe that such a contingency would be an opportunity for the workers to inaugurate a new society in which they would own the means of life; and on the principle that only hungry men revolt, there might seem to be some grounds for such optimism. But there are other factors to be considered. The gradual process of weakening the workers' position by depleting their Union funds leaves the masters in a much stronger position relatively; for though the tendency is towards a general lockout and an absolute stagnation of all trade, it will not be allowed to develop to the dangerous point. The unemployment insurance dole was created for the purpose of preventing absolute destitution and staving off this dangerous point; and when the workers are sufficiently weakened, the markets emptied of their surplus commodities, there will be a revival and the "shamming dead" performance of many industries in Britain will cease. It is all very well to talk about the miners fighting the battle of other workers; they are; but what is the use of fighting if they cannot win in the end? I am not depreciating the miners' efforts; all honour to them. I am merely trying to show that the day has gone by for sectional fights. If it is necessary to consider all the effects of a general strike when a crisis develops, it is also necessary to follow the effects of a sectional fight, and see where that leads to.

How Contracts are Lost.

It is customary for the suborned press to attribute the loss of any contract by a British firm to the greed and turbulence of the British worker, who, we are told, are gradually driving capital abroad and actually helping to kill British trade and industry. These diatribes against the "lazy, rapacious" British worker contrast very strangely with the statements of writers in trade papers like "The British Trade Journal," who, when desirous of influencing foreign and Colonial buyers, are in the habit of extolling "British goods by British workers" as the "acme of perfection, and cheapest by far in the long run." In discussing the relative dimensions of, say, American and British trade in Spanish America, we are led to believe that, though the U.S.A. has geographic advantages, the superior quality of British goods will ensure a large measure of the trade, and so on. In fact, the cant and humbug to be found in trade journals regarding British commodities is only equalled by the lies and insinuations directed against the worker in this country, when it is a question of influencing him to be meek and thankful for small mercies. The British worker is probably no better or worse than the workers of other countries, everything else being equal; but it seems strange that to his face he should be told that he is a scamperer of work, and through trade journals learn that he is remarkably efficient and industrious; strange, that is, to those who do not understand what a dirty game it all is. It is rare indeed that we hear anything in our hired press in the way of criticism of the British capitalist and his inability even to run his own business properly. However, the cat does sometimes come out of the bag. Here is a statement from the "Daily News" showing that there is a growing uneasiness even in the capitalist press as to the soundness of British methods, even from a capitalist point of view:

"HOW CONTRACTS ARE LOST.

"Melbourne, Tuesday, May 17th.—The Victorian Electricity Commission has accepted a single American tender of £379,000 for switch-gear and transformers. This represents a saving of £200,000 on a combination of sectional tenders by various British firms. No British firm put in a tender for the material in one lot.—Reuter."

This is a striking commentary on the vaunted ability of the British manufacturer as second to none inh is ability to compete with outsiders, and as wages are as high in Australia as in Britain, the question of the workers' greed is effectually precluded. We are told that Labour cannot govern: it is about time we told the British capitalists that he can't even run his own business properly.

RED YOUTH NOTES. By T. Islwyn Nicholas.

Young International.

The manifesto published by the Berlin Congress of the Y.P.C.I. enflamed as with torches the hearts of many hundreds of thousands of young workers. A few months after the Congress the following organisations had already given their acquiescence to the programme formulated in Berlin, and had accepted the tactics recommended. The Young Communist organisation in Lithuania, White Russia, and the border countries; the great organisation in Russia, comprising over 100,000 members; parts in Finland, groups in Poland, the organisations in Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Belgium, Yugo-Slavia; Hungary, Greece, the Young Communist Union in Austria, the Netherlands, the Free Socialist Youth in Germany, the Young Unions in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and strong groups in France and Czecho-Slovakia. New Young Communist organisations have originated at the same time in Ireland, Scotland, England, and Wales. Communist organisations have been brought into existence in the United States, Africa, etc., as well as in the Far East, in Turkestan and in Siberia. The Young International encircles the world like a ring. There is no country where groups and organisations of it are not active; no country wherein thousands of young hearts do not beat faster on hearing its name. The first condition and proposition for a victorious realisation of the Proletarian Revolution is a united, trained, ready and able revolutionary International of Youth.

"Red Dawn."

The E.C. of the I.P.S.M. has decided to suspend the publication of the "Red Dawn" owing to the enormous financial loss resulting from its publication. However, our old and trusted comrade, Tom Anderson, who is the editor of the paper, has stepped forward and offered to publish it and sell it at one penny as an eight-paged paper, and further has undertaken to take all the financial responsibilities. "I can make it pay," he writes, "but it must be a children's paper." We wish him good luck, and believe that actions speak louder than words.

Red Youth and Unity.

In response to the appeal contained in Comrade Bammatter's letter, and which was published in these columns, the Young Workers' League has offered to discuss the question with a view to unity with the I.P.S.M. The matter now rests with the E.C. of that body, which we hope will hurry up and get something done.

Our Maxim No. 9

Thou shalt perform a mission in society by achieving an ideal of a fuller and higher life for all, in the abolition of classes, and by the regulation of industry by the Soviet Republic, which shall end the political State.

To Youth.

Louder and louder do we raise our cry, and ever loftier sound our songs:

Arise, ye prisoners of starvation!
Arise, ye wretched of the earth,
For justice thunders condemnation,
A better world's in birth.

And our cry and the song resounds in all countries all over the world. They reach you, young comrades, suffering in the sulphur-mines of Silesia; you hungering comrades in the factories and coal-mines of France, England and Germany; in the gigantic undertakings of America; you millions of tortured apprentices; you millions of young workers of both sexes in Europe, America, Asia and Africa. Listen all of you! You feel your muscles and nerves stiffening to the task; you leap up and out of want and misery, from dreary offices, work-places, smoky factories, and dark mines and pits. Out of the cinema, the ale-houses and other places of self-delusion! Out of the bourgeois military clubs! Out of the Boy Scout corps! Out of the hypocritical neutral clubs! Out of the Labour Party! Your way leads to us—into our organisation. You belong to us. Enter the Young Communist League! A hundred thousand hands are thrust forth to you. Grasp them firmly, Comrades! Young soldiers of the Proletarian Revolution, of the Red Army, close up your ranks. Rally to the red banners of the Young People's Communist International!

To hell with all national frontiers!
Remove the frontiers!
Hail, the World Revolution!

At Pontypridd, on Tuesday, Dolling and Cook, of the South Wales Miners, were committed to trial at the Assizes on the charge of unlawful assembly.

WOMAN'S CONFERENCE AT BERLIN.

On May 7th in Berlin the delegates of Communist women held a conference. Comrade Hertha Sturm gave a specially interesting report of the agitation which was being carried on amongst the women. Many holders of mandates for town and county councils expressed themselves on communistic work inside these bourgeois parliamentary bodies. Without exception the speakers declared for a stricter centralisation, so that the parliamentary fractions should work in closer touch with the party, and subordinate themselves to party discipline. Proposals for practical reform should only have as their object the exposure of the falseness of the bourgeois and pseudo-socialist governing bodies.

Comrade Berta Braunthal gave a report on the women's organisation. In point of membership she showed the progress of the women's movement in the whole country. "The Kommunistin," the official organ of the women's organisation, shows an increased circulation of from eight to ten thousand per week. A short time ago only 25,000 to 30,000 were sold, now it exceeds 50,000. Also the "Tribune of the Proletarian Woman" which appears every Saturday as a supplement to the Berlin "Rote Fahne," has a large reading public.

Speakers from all parts of Germany took part in the discussion. The delegates of Central Germany and Hamburg described the part taken by women in the revolutionary action of the party. Their fighting spirit was unbroken, in spite of the dreadful suffering that was going on all round them. We are organising and working now in readiness for the next "action, which must be managed in a more united and effectual manner." Not discouragement, but firm defiance and rage against the hordes of the counter-revolution are the results of the great fights. Help for the people who were being pursued and imprisoned had been organised by the women. With pride the delegates spoke of women who had fought side by side with men in Central Germany, or who had nursed the wounded as red sisters, and who were thrown into gaol as punishment. Many a one amongst the delegates had the beadles on her track, but fear for personal safety no longer actuated these people.

This conference in Berlin is yet another proof of the strength of the movement in Germany. We wish our German comrades every success, and send them our greeting.

Workers' Dreadnought

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

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

SUBSCRIPTION:

THREE MONTHS (13 weeks)	... Post Free	2/9
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks)	... " "	5/5
ONE YEAR (52 weeks)	... " "	10/10

Vol. VIII. No. 12. Saturday, June 4, 1921

A QUERY AND AN ANSWER.

Comrades, why did the Capitalist Press give publicity to the trial, imprisonment, and release of the Editor of this paper?

Because the subject was "good copy." In other words, the Press knew that the public wanted to know about it and would buy the Capitalist newspapers if they gave reports and pictures of the event.

Like the Capitalist Press, we know that the people, the masses in whose interests we are fighting, want to read the *Dreadnought*.

But they do not know the *Dreadnought*, and they do not know where to buy it.

We have not the means to tell them in the way the Capitalist tells them. We cannot employ armies of publicity agents. We cannot placard the walls and the bookseller's stalls. We cannot afford to make a splash with advertisements.

But *you* can do the work, you can advertise more efficiently than the millions of Capitalism because you are not paid hacks, but enthusiasts with principles to advertise.

The moral is: increase your order for the *Dreadnought*, and see that you dispose of every copy.

A BIG SACRIFICE.

Dear Comrade Pankhurst,—I do hope that your health will permit you to take up your duties as Editor at an early date. You have once more made a big sacrifice for what you believed to be right. We are in the final struggle. Our enemy, driven into a corner, fights with more ferocity. I must congratulate the Comrades who, in your absence, kept the "Dreadnought" up to the high standard which you set. With best wishes from the Communist Party of South Africa, I remain, yours for Communism, A. B. Dunbar (of the Communist Party of South Africa).

WHAT GERMAN WOMEN THINK.

The "Sanctions" and the Working Women.

(From the Silesian "Arbeiter Zeitung.)

Everyone to-day is talking about "sanctions." What are these sanctions? Why are they exciting the people so much? What is expected of them?

The sanctions are oppressive measures used by the victorious Entente in order to recover the debts which the German bourgeoisie took over by signing the Peace Treaty of Versailles.

How did these debts come about? The Entente set out to make a peace "without annexations or indemnities"—that is to say, without robbing territory or costs of the war. Now, the Entente does not call the occupation of German territory annexation, but the emancipation of Alsace Lorraine, also the emancipation of the Saar province; while the debts which the German Government is to pay are not costs of the war but "reparations" of what has been destroyed during the war. These names, therefore, are chosen, and now we are coming to the gist of the matter.

The Entente needs these costs. The German bourgeoisie cannot pay them, and will not pay them. The Entente will and must force the German bourgeoisie to pay, therefore they occupy fresh provinces, namely the most important industrial provinces (the Ruhr district and perhaps also Upper Silesia). They take for themselves pledges, for example: the taxes, certain duties, tasks, railways, and industrial undertakings. What can the German bourgeoisie do against that?

First of all they can try to keep for themselves the war material, but they would not be so foolish as that, for they know that nothing is to be got out of that. They are making counter-proposals; they are falling in with the demands of the Entente; they will pay.

But where will they get the money? They protest that they have not got it, and yet they have resolved on two hundred milliard marks. Think of that! They will squeeze that sum out of the working-class. What does that mean?

It is very simple. Wages are reduced, the hours of labour are increased, the prices are raised for the necessaries of life (bread and clothing). Taxes are raised. Everything is taxed now as far up as the air. Factories which do not "pay" are shut down. In short, they are trying to raise their profits, so that they can push their debts off on to their dupes without being disturbed in their own habits and style of living. 3

But what does this mean for the proletariat? What does this mean especially for the working-class woman?

IT MEANS THE GRADUAL DEATH OF THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT. All the misery that is already there must increase enormously. The lack of housing and infantile mortality will both increase terribly.

WHAT SHOULD THE PROLETARIAT DO AGAINST THAT?

The bourgeoisie say "Work and weep, because William of the mailed fist is no longer here to protect his people"; the S.D.P. and the U.S.P. say: "Yield. Bear all the burdens and rely on the time when 'justice' will once more come into the world, and when the proletarians of other countries shall revolt"; the Communists say: "Chase the bourgeoisie to the devil, and take the fate of the country into your own hands."

But the women will say to that: "Oh, this is civil war! The Entente will demand the same thing from us!"

True! But the way of the bourgeoisie is the way to certain ruin, and so we ask the proletarian woman: "What is the better thing for the proletariat. To perish slowly, from pestilence, starvation, and nakedness, or to go to war, where of course many husbands and sons of the proletarian women will fall, but where the whole class will be saved, for then the proletarian Germany will link up with, proletarian Russia, and will at least be able to keep its head above water, while if it gives into its bourgeoisie it is condemned to certain death."

Then indeed Soviet Germany will take on itself the burden of the debts, but only until such time as the proletarians of the Entente countries wake up: just as the Russian proletariat were obliged to bear the consequences of the Treaty of Brest until the German workers revolted in 1918.

The Entente proletariat will not look unmoved on a proletarian Germany. Revolutions are catching and do not stop at political boundaries.

The proletarian woman must now in such a case decide for the civil war, for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, because a lingering death is more terrible than a short fight for freedom, which can be the only safe way.

AUSTRALIAN LABOUR AND FUTURE WARS.

"Labour [in Australia] has now determined —and determined officially—that so far as Australia is concerned, it will never again become the catspaw of the capitalistic system in waging wars outside the Commonwealth."—"The Australian Worker."

This journal further remarks:—

"Labour in Australia will henceforth mind its own business, and have no truck with those treaties, combinations and understandings which hitherto have committed the workers to draw the sword in securing new markets, or in settling other people's quarrels.

"Furthermore, Labour determines to take no orders from Downing Street, notwithstanding any ukase or obligation which William Morris Hughes, in the name of the Commonwealth, may see fit to contract.

"More than that, Australian Labour, instead of being 'a bad advertisement,' now sets the pace, and if workers the world over fall into line there will be an end to international strife. Confined to their own borders the bottom falls out of the mischievous machinations of trade marauders and militarists.

"The present chaos of the nations, and the absolute impotence of the old gang to straighten the tangle, forces the conviction that Labour in its solidarity can alone place this dottering, tottering, war-tossed world upon an even keel, and the Sydney determination points the way."

PRINCE OF WALES.

Mediæval Court Revival.

According to the "Morning Post," a mediæval custom was revived at Launceston, the old-time capital of Cornwall, by the Prince of Wales, as Duke of Cornwall, holding a court of fee, and receiving from his tenants, in person, "those rents, customs, and services anciently accustomed to be paid and made."

So as we, comrades, go on toward the new order of society, the upholders of capitalism are endeavouring to go backward to mediævalism and feudal domination. Onward, forward press, comrades, for the new must ever outrun the old.

SOUTH AFRICAN VIEWS OF EMIGRATION AND BIG FINANCE.

We cull the following from "The South African Review," the oldest weekly journal published in South Africa:—

To Emigrate or not to Emigrate?

"Mr. Lloyd George, representing the traditional Tory attitude towards the unemployed, recommends emigration to British Dominions oversea. There is one British Dominion oversea, however, emigration to which is being discouraged excepting in the case of wealthy persons, and that Dominion of course is South Africa. Mr. W. H. Tadlow, head of the Union Publicity Department, is leaving England this week after his busy advertising campaign. He says that as the result of his tour many settlers of the right sort will come to South Africa, that is, settlers with from £1,500 to £15,000, and that one thing kept in the forefront throughout his campaign was to deter people who were not of the right type from going to South Africa. The Memorial Settlers' Association also will not consider settlers with less than £1,500.

Big Finance the World's Ruler.

"There was issued from the office of the Bank of England recently the announcement that the bank rate had been reduced to 6½ per cent., and Reuter, cabling the news, said:—

"'Stockbrokers are now speculating on the prospects of a revival of the markets with the lifting of one of the most restricting influences on business and trade generally.

"'The name 'Bank of England' misleads many into supposing that it is a national institution, but it is purely a private concern, as private as the Standard Bank or the National Bank. It is seen, then, that a few private persons, directors of the Bank of England, make decisions which affect 'business and trade generally.' By restricting credit, by raising the bank rate, they can throw millions out of work; by relaxing credit, by reducing the bank rate, they can ma kemillions busy. And yet, despite such a truth as this being blazoned forth in the Press (and many others also), revealing the power wielded by private persons over the fortunes of whole peoples) the general mass of the populace still allow themselves to remain under the doping impression that their welfare resides in their elected representatives in Parliaments assembled.

The Super Cabinet Uber Alles.

"It is not, however, the directors of the Bank of England alone who decide matters of life and death to millions of people by a stroke of the pen. This is only the office from which the announcements are issued. The decision is made by a Super-Cabinet of British, American, French and German Financiers. This super-cabinet sat in conference at Paris simultaneously with the Peace Conference and dominated the latter. Subsequently it met at Brussels and decided upon the war on wages, to be waged by means of a general restriction of credit. The simple meaning of this war on wages was that enterprise must be restricted, and unemployment made rife, until existing finance had been adjusted. That is to say, they were to be paid first, and when the money came in they would kindly lend it out again. This policy set up by the Super-Cabinet (International Conference of Financiers at Brussels) was immediately adopted by all Governments simultaneously, and by the Smuts Government the more slavishly of all. Even one of their own supporters (Mr. Macintosh, member for Port Elizabeth) has said so, and it is precisely true."

THE RED VICAR.

Our thanks and congratulations to the Rev. Conrad Noel for his bravery in proclaiming to the world that his definition of the teaching of the Nazarine is Communism. We think he is right. If the Nazarine existed as a man, and his teaching is promulgated in the Gospels, then he was a Communist, without doubt. Therefore, Christians, if your aim is to follow the Christ, nail his colours to your mast, as has the Rev. Conrad Noel.

DREADNOUGHT DEVELOPMENT FUND

(Additional to week ending 17th May.)

Hatfield friend (to make up deficit of last week's £30), £12 10s.

Week ending, 24th May.—Six Communists, 6s 6d; Brett, 5s; Anon., 5s; "Inky," 4s; Miss Ella Wright, £1; Mrs. Beckett, £1; Mr Foxall, 2s 6d; Wm. Reid, 10s; J. Bernstein, 2s 3d; F. Robinson, 2s; Leigh Rothwell, £1; Geo. Sear, 4s; Anon., £1. Total, £16 11s 3d.

Week ending May 31st.—Mrs. A. Gilbert, 5s; A. Symes, 2s; Anon., £2; per S. A. Chandler, 7s; Anon., 2s 6d; Clyde, 6d; three members of Sir Basil Thomson's staff, £1; F. Thomas, 2s 6d; Mr. Bruslem, 5s; A. Revolutionist, 3s; Collection at reception, £5 12s 9d. Total, £10 0s 3d.

OPEN LETTER TO COMRADE LENIN.

An Answer to Lenin's Brochure: "'LEFT WING' COMMUNISM: AN INFANTILE DISORDER."

By HERMAN [illegible], every- [illegible] own

(*Continued.*)

From the necessity of this development in Western Europe (which has sprung up through the power of the banking-capital), it is also clearly evident that those who already now in the beginning and the course of the revolution wish to place the Arbeiter-Union, the Industrial Union, the industrial organisation, above the Party, or who even wish to abolish the latter, are wrong.

Gradually, as the Party grows stronger, as the Union grows, as the class becomes more and more communistic, as the revolution approaches its goal, class, party, and Arbeiter-Union or Industrial Union come very near to one another. In the end the Party, the Union and the class are all equivalent, and are blended into one whole.

Finally, of course, the power and the unity of all bourgeois classes, and the necessary unity of the entire proletariat, render a strong centralisation and a strict discipline, in the Party as well as in the Union, absolutely necessary.

It is the task of the German and English, the West-European and American proletariat to combine centralisation and discipline with the strictest control of, with the power over, the leadership.

For only thus, through this blending of centralisation in the leadership, and under the control of the members, the West-European and American proletariat can conquer.

It need hardly be explained here, that also after the revolution the dictatorship of the entire class, and the communistic spirit of the entire proletariat in Western Europe and America are absolutely necessary. For here the counter-revolution is so powerful, that in case these two conditions were not fulfilled—in case, for instance, a new class of rulers sprang up, out of the intellectuals and the bureaucracy, so that corruption reigned—the revolution would soon perish. Now already the tactics must be on the watch to prevent this.

How different from Russia, all this!

How different from Russia, where, through the economic conditions, through the class relations—and rightly, therefore—a handful of people rule the Party, where an infinitesimally small party rules the class, and a minutely small class the entire nation; where no Arbeiter-Union is needed, where the class, and the great majority of the remaining working masses, the small peasants, were one in the revolution!

Whoever fails to understand from the productive and class-relations of Western Europe what the relations between the leaders, the party the class and the mass are, does not understand a thing of the revolution in Western Europe, nor of its necessary stipulations. Whoever wishes to conduct the West-European revolution according to the tactics and by the road of the Russian revolution, is not qualified to conduct it.

The Left Wing Tactics.

From these West-European, and to some extent also from the American and Anglo-Colonial relations, it is therefore perfectly evident, that there is only one kind of tactics that in West Europe (and North America) can lead to the victory, and those are the tactics of the Left Wing, in the name of which I am speaking. For these claim that the leaders, as compared to the classes, shall have relatively little power, and the class a relatively far greater power. These say that for the time being the class and the rest of the masses cannot be one. These claim that the entire class shall become truly communistic, through a truly Communist propaganda, that therefore party and class shall become one. These, in order to obtain that end, wish to destroy the bourgeois Trade Unions, and replace them by communistic industrial organisations, thus rendering also those organisations, the substitutes for the Trade Unions, the greatest of class organisations (in Germany they number over ten millions of proletarians already), equal to the class. These are against parliamentarism, thus rendering every worker, and consequently the entire proletariat, independently revolutionary, which is to say communistic.

They, the Left party, act in perfect accordance therefore to the class relations as they actually are in Western Europe, and are entirely in the right over against the Executive Committee, the Congress of the Third International, and over against you, Comrade Lenin.

Only quite recently you said to a British delegation that in England a quite small Communist Party would be able to accomplish the revolution. Here, again, you speak as a Russian, and judge things by the Russian example. And it is on such mistaken notions that the tactics of the Executive and of the International are based! *

Those, however, who think, and say, and propagate these views, do not understand a thing about the class relations in Western Europe and North America.†

To these observations I need only add that where I speak of the unity of party and class, that is attained at last, and of the possibility of the entire proletariat in Western Europe and America becoming communistic, I mean as big as possible a unity, and a great part of the proletariat. I represent the total Unity and the entire proletariat as the Ideal, as the goal towards which we must tend, as the aim of our tactics. To all probability it will be impossible and unnecessary to completely achieve it. But the unity of party and class, and the portion of the proletariat that has to become communistic, are so immeasurably greater here than in Russia, that this ideal in the tactics must be brought to the front. ‡

Lenin's Third Arguments.

Next I come to your third argument: the Russian examples. You mention them repeatedly (on pp. I—9 they occur several times). I have read them with the greatest attention, and, as I admired them before, I do now. I have been on your side ever since 1903. Also when I did not know your motives as yet—the connections being cut off—as at the time of the Brest-Litovsk peace, I defended you with your own motives. Your tactics were certainly brilliant for Russia, and it is owing to these tactics that the Russians have triumphed. But what does this prove for Western Europe? Nothing, according to my idea, or very little. The Soviets, the dictatorship of the proletarit, the methods for the revolution and for the reconstruction, all this we accept. Also your international, foreign tactics have been—so far at least—exemplary. But for your tactics for the countries of Western Europe it is different. And this is only natural.

How could the tactics in the East and West of Europe possibly be the same? Russia, a country chiefly of agriculture, but with an industrial capitalism that was only partially highly developed, and very small as compared to the land. And fed, moreover, to a great extent by foreign capital! In Western Europe, and especially in England and Germany, it is just the opposite. With you: all the old-fashioned forms of capital yet, from the usury capital upwards. With us: almost exclusively a highly developed banking-capital. With you: immense remains of the feudal and pre-feudal times, and even out of the times of the tribe of barbarism. With us, and especially in England and Germany: all things, agriculture, commerce, transport, industry, in the ban of the highest developed capitalism. With you: immense remains of serfdom, the poor peasants, and in the country a declining middle class. With us: even the poor peasants in relation with modern production, transport, technique and exchange. And in the city as well as in the country the middle-class, also the lowest layers, in direct contact with the great-capitalists.

You still have classes with which the rising proletariat can unite. The very existence of these classes helps. The same applies, of course, to the political parties. And with us, nothing of all this.

Of course the compromising in all direction, as you so captivatingly describe it, this making use of the rifts even between the Liberals and the land-owners, was good with you. With us it is impossible. Consequently, the difference in tactics—in the East and the West. Our tactics fit our conditions. They are just as good as yours were under Russian conditions.

I find your Russian examples especially on pages 12 13 26 27 37 40 51 and 52. But no matter what these examples may mean for the Russian Trade Union question (page 27), for Western Europe they mean nothing at all, as here the proletariat needs far stronger weapons. As far as parliamentarism is concerned, your examples have been taken from a period when the revolution had not broken out (pp. 16, 26, 41 and 51, for instance), and these, therefore, either do not apply to the point in question, or, in so far as you could use the parties of the poor peasants and small bourgeoisie, they are so different from conditions here (pp. 12, 37, 40, 41 and 51), as to mean nothing for us.**

It seems to me, Comrade, that your utterly wrong judgment, the utterly mistaken conception of your book, and no less the tactics of the Executive in Moscow, are to be attributed exclusively to the fact that you do not know enough about relations over here, or rather that you fail to draw the right conclusions from what you know, that you judge things too much from the Russian point of view.

This means, however—and it should be emphasised here once again, as the fate of the West-European proletariat, the world-proletariat, the world-revolution depend on this—that neither you, nor the Executive of Moscow, as long as you adhere to these tactics, are able to direct the West-European, and consequently the World Revolution.

You ask: Is it possible that you, who wish to reform the world, cannot even form a fraction in parliament?

Labour Movement in False Grooves.

We answer: This book of yours is a proof in itself that whoever tries to do the latter is bound to lead the Labour movement into false grooves, into ruin.

The book deludes the workers of Western Europe by means of illusions, of the impossible: compromise with the bourgeois parties in the revolution.

It makes them believe in something that does not exist: the possibility of the bourgeois parties being divided in Western Europe, in the revolution. It makes them believe that here a compromise with the social-patriots and the wavering (!) elements in parliament can lead to any good, whereas it brings hardly anything but calamity.

Your book leads the West-European proletariat back into the morass, from which at the cost of the greatest efforts it has not yet escaped, but is beginning to escape.

It leads us back into the morass, in which men like Scheidemann, Clynes, Renaudel, Kautsky, Macdonald, Longuet, Vandervelde, Branting and Troelstra have landed us. (It must inevitably fill all these with great joy, and the bourgeois parties likewise, if these understand it.) This book is to the communistic revolutionary proletariat what Bernstein's book has been for the pre-revolutionary proletariat. It is your first book that is not good. For Western Europe it is the worst book imaginable.

We, comrades of the Left Wing, must stand close together, must start everything from below upward, and must criticise as keenly as possible all those that in the Third International do not go the right way.†† 3

Thus the conclusion to be drawn from all these arguments about parliamentarism, is as follows: Your three arguments for parliamentarism mean either very little, or they are wrong. And, as in the Trade Union question, your tactics also on this point are disastrous for the proletariat. And with these mistaken or insignificant motives you hide the fact that you are bringing hundreds of thousands of opportunists into the Third International.

IV.

OPPORTUNISM IN THIRD INTERNATIONAL.

The question of opportunism in our own ranks is of such immense weight that I must deal with it more at length.

Comrade! With the establishment of the Third International, opportunism has not died in our ranks either. We see it in all Communist parties, in all countries. Also it would be truly miraculous, and against all the laws of development, if that which killed the Second International, did not live on in the Third.

On the contrary, just as the fight between anarchism and social-democracy was fought in the Second International, that between opportunism and

* I here point out the contradiction between this opinion and the effort of winning millions of wavering elements for the Third International. This contradiction is another proof for the opportunism of your tactics.

† A very strong proof of how the Board of the Third International judges all things from the Russian standpoint, is the following: After the German revolution had been beaten down, after the Bavarian and the Hungarian revolutions had been crushed, Moscow said to the German and the Hungarian proletariat: "Be comforted, and bear up. for in March and July, 1917, we also were defeated; but in November we won. As it went with us, it will go with you." And to be sure, this time again Moscow is saying the same to the Czecho-Slovakian workers. But the Russians have won in November exclusively because then the poor peasants did no longer support Kerensky! Where, Oh Executive Committee, are the millions of poor peasants in Germany, Bavaria, Hungary, and in Czecho-Slovakia? There are none. Your words are just utter nonsense. The perniciousness of these Moscow tactics, however, does not lie solely in that they console the workers by means of a false image, but more especially in the fact that they fail to draw the right conclusion from the defeat in Germany, Bavaria Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia. The lesson they teach is this: "Destroy your Trade Unions, and form industrial unions, thus rendering your Party and your class strong internally." Instead of this lesson, however, we only hear: "It will go with you as it did with us!" Is it not high time that, against these tactics of Moscow, all over Western Europe there should arise one firmly organised, iron opposition? It is a question of life and death for the world-revolution itself. And also for the Russian revolution.

‡ With regard to this we must bear in mind that here we are always speaking of a disarmed proletariat. If, through some reason or other: through a new war, or, later on, in the course of the revolution, the proletariat should once more obtain the arms, the above-named conditions do not count.

** To deal with all these Russian examples would be too monotonous. I request the reader to read them all over. He will see that what I have said above is right.

†† Personally I believe that in countries where the revolution is far off yet, and the workers are not yet strong enough to make it, parliamentarism can yet be used. The sharpest criticism of the parliamentary delegates is necessary in that case. Other comrades, I believe, are of a different opinion.

will be fought in the Third. Many Communists will go into parliament, become leaders. Trade Unions and Labour parties will be supported for the sake of votes in the elections. Instead of parties being founded for Communism, Communism will be used to found parties. But parliamentary compromises with social patriots and bourgeois elements will once more come in use, as after all the revolution in Western Europe is going to be a slow process. The freedom of speech will be suppressed, and all good Communists expelled. In a word, all the practices of the Second International will come to life again.

To this the Left Wing must oppose itself; it has to be there, to wage this fight, as it was there in the Second International. Herein the Left Wing must be supported by all Marxists and revolutionaries, also if these are of opinion that in detail the Left Wing is mistaken—for opportunism is our greatest enemy. Not only, as you say (p. 13) outside, but also within our ranks.

It would be a thousand times worse, that opportunism, with its devastating effect on the soul and the strength of the proletariat, should again slip in, than that the Left Wing should be too radical. The Left Wing, even though at times it should go too far, ever remains revolutionary. The Left Wing will alter its tactics as soon as it sees that they are not right. The opportunistic Right will grow ever more opportunistic, will sink ever more into the morass, will corrupt the workers to an ever greater extent. Not in vain have we learnt from the twenty-five years of struggle.

Opportunism is the plague of the Labour movement, the death of the revolution. Opportunism has brought about all evils, reformism, the war, the defeat, the death of the revolution in Hungary and Germany. Opportunism is the cause of disaster. And it exists in the Third International.

What do I need many words for? Look around you, Comrade. Look into yourself, and into the Executive Committee! Look into all countries of Europe.

Feeble Criticism.

Read the papers of the British Socialist Party, now the Communist Party. Read ten, twenty numbers of this paper; read the feeble criticism against the Trade Unions, the Labour Party, the Members of Parliament, and compare this to the paper of the Left Wing. A comparison between these two will show you that opportunism is approaching the Third International, in immense masses. Once more (through support of the counter-revolutionary workers) to obtain power in Parliament. A power after the pattern of the Second International. Remember, also, that soon the U.S.P. will enter the Third International, and numerous other Centre parties besides! Do you not believe that if you compel these parties to expel Kautsky that a swarm of tens of thousands of other opportunists will come? The entire measure of this expulsion is childish. An innumerable stream of opportunists is approaching ‡‡—especially since your brochure.

Look at the Dutch Communist Party, once called the Bolshevists of Europe. And rightly so, taking into account the conditions. Read the brochure about the Dutch Party, how utterly already it has been corrupted by the opportunism of the Second International. During the war, and after it, and even to this day, it has pledged itself to the Entente. The once brilliant party has become an example of equivocality and deceit.

But look at Germany, Comrade, the land where the revolution has started. There opportunism lives and thrives. We were utterly amazed on hearing that you defended the attitude of the K.P.D. during the March days. But fortunately we learnt from your brochure that you did not know the actual course of development. You did sanction the attitude of the K.P.D.—Zentrale, that offered loyal opposition to Ebert, Scheidemann, Hilferding and Crispien, but you evidently did not know, at the time of writing the brochure, that this happened in the same moment, in which Ebert collected the troops against the German proletariat, in which the universal strike was still spread all over Germany, and in which the great majority of the Communist mass strove to bring the revolution if not to the victory (perhaps this was hardly possible as yet), but at any rate to a higher strength. Whilst the mass, by means of strikes and armed revolt, conducted the revolution into a further stage (there has never been anything more hopeful or gigantic than the revolt in the Ruhr region, and the general strike), the leaders offered parliamentary compromises. In so doing they supported Ebert against the revolution in the Ruhr region.*† If ever an example proved how damnable the use of parliamentarism is in the revolution, it is this one. You see, Comrade, that is the parliamentary opportunism, that is the compromise with the social-patriots and the Independents, which we refuse to accept, and which you try to further.

And, Comrade, what has become, already now, of the industrial councils in Germany? You and the Executive of the Third International had advised the Communists to unite with all the other trends, in order to obtain the lead of the Trade Unions. And what has happened? The opposite. The industrial Zentrale has well-night developed into an instrument of the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions are an octopus, strangling everything living that comes within its reach.

Comrade, if you read, and investigate everything that is being done in Germany, in Western Europe, I have full confidence that you will come over to our side. Just as I believe that your experiences in the Third International will convert you to our tactics.

However, if opportunism proceeds thus in Germany, now will it be in France and England!

You see, Comrade, those are the leaders we do not want. That is the unity of mass and leader that we do not want. And that is the iron discipline, the military obedience, submission and servility that we do not want.

Permit us to add here one word to the Executive Committee, and especially to Radek: The Executive Committee has had the insolence to demand of the K.A.P.D. that they should expel Wolfheim and Lauffenberg, instead of leaving them to settle this for themselves. It has received the K.A.P.D. with threats, and has pandered to the central parties, as the U.S.P. But it did not demand of the Italian Party that it should expel the Zentrale which, through its offer, was partly responsible for the murdering of Communists in the Ruhr region. It did not demand of the Dutch Party that it should expel Wynkoop and van Reversteyn, who during the war, offered Dutch ships to the Entente. This does not mean to say that I myself wish those comrades to be expelled. On the contrary, I hold them to be good comrades, who have gone wrong only because the development, the beginning of the West-European revolution, is so terribly difficult. We, all of us over here, will make many big mistakes as yet. Moreover, the expulsion at present, in this International, would be of no avail.

I only point this out to demonstrate by another example how fiercely opportunism is raging already in our own ranks. For the Moscow Central Committee has committed this injustice against the K.A.P.D. only, because for her opportunistic world-tactics it did not want the really revolutionary elements, but the opportunistic Independents, etc. On purpose it has used the tactics of Wolfheim and Lauffenberg against the K.A.P.D., although it knew that the K.A.P.D. did NOT agree with these tactics—for the most miserably opportunistic of reasons. Because it wants to have masses round it, like the Trade Unions and the political parties, no matter whether those masses are communistic or no.

Two moreo ther sections of the Third International prove clearly whither it is drifting. The first is the discharge of the Amsterdam Bureau, the ONLY group of revolutionary Marxists and theoreticians in Western Europe, that has never wavered. The second action, which is almost more serious, is the treatment of the K.A.P.D., the ONLY party in Western Europe which, as an organisation, as a whole, from its very origin upward, has conducted the revolution as it should be conducted. Whilst the Centre parties, the Independents, the French and English Centre, that ever betrayed the revolution, were allured by all possible means, the K.A.P.D., the real revolutionaries, were treated as enemies. Those are bad signs, Comrade.

In a word: the Second International is still alive, or again alive, in our midst. And opportunism leads to ruin. And because this is so, and because opportunism is very strong amongst us, far stronger that I could ever have imagined, the Left Wing has to be there. Even if there should be no other good reasons for its existence, it would have to be there as opposition, to counter-balance opportunism.

Alas, Comrade, if only you had followed the tactics of the Left Wing in the Third International; those tactics, that are nothing but the "pure" tactics of the Bolshevists in Russia, adapted to the West-European (and North-American) conditions!

If only, as stipulations and statutes for the Third International, you had proposed and carried through the economic organisation in industrial organisations and workers' unions (into which, if need be, industrial unions on a craft basis might have been introduced), and the political organisation into parties with the rejection of parliamentarism!

Then you would in the first place have had, in all countries, absolutely firm kernels, parties that could really carry out the revolution, parties that would gradually have gathered the masses around them, through their own example, in their own country, and not through pressure from outside. Then you would have had economic organisations that would have annihilated the counter-revolutionary Trade Unions (the syndicalistic as well as the free).

And then with ONE stroke you would have cut off the way for all opportunists. For these can thrive only where there is plotting with the counter-revolution.

Then, likewise—and this is by far the most important point—you would have educated the workers into independent fighters to a very high degree, as far as it is possible in the present stage.

If you, Lenin, and you, Zinovier, Bucharin and Radek, had done this, had chosen these tactics, with your authority and experience, your strength and genius, and if you had helped us to eradicate the faults that cling to us as yet, and to our tactics, then we would have got a Third International that was perfectly firm internally, and unshakable externally, an International which would gradually have gathered the entire proletariat around it, through the force of its example, and which would have erected Communism.

It is true there are no tactics without defeat. But these would have suffered least defeat, and would most easily have recovered from it; they would have gone the quickest way, and would have won the quickest and surest victory. Yours lead to repeated defeat for the proletariat.

However, you have rejected this, because, instead of conscious, steadfast fighters, you wanted partly or wholly unconscious masses.

CONCLUSION.

Finally I have to make a few observation regarding your last chapter: "Conclusions," the most important, perhaps, of your entire book. Again I was delighted with it, as long as I thought of the Russian revolution. But over and over again the thought came into my head: the tactics that are brilliant for Russia are bad here. They lead to defeat here.

You assert here, Comrade (pp. 68—74), that in a certain stage of development the masses must be attracted, millions and millions of them. The propaganda for "pure" Communism, that collected the avant-garde, and educated it, suffices no longer in that stage. Now is the time . . . and next follow once more your opportunist methods that I have already refuted: the profiting of "rifts," of small bourgeois enements, etc.

Comrade, this chapter also is altogether wrong. You judge as a Russian, not as an international Communist who knows the real West-European capitalism.

Every word almost of this chapter, wonderful though it may be for the knowledge of your revolution, is wrong for the great industrial capitalism, for the capitalism of the trusts and monopolies.

I will demonstrate this here: first in small matters.

Still need for Propaganda.

You write about Communism in Western Europe: "The avant-garde of the West-European proletarias has been won" (p. 70). This is wrong, Comrade. "The period of propaganda is past" (p. 69). This is not true. "The proletarian avant-garde has been won ideally." This is not so, Comrade. This stands on a line (and it proceeds from the same mentality) as what I read from Bucharin, not long ago: "English capitalism is bankrupt." Also from Radek I read similar phantasies, that were more like astrology than like astronomy. Nothing of all this is true. Except for Germany, there is no avant-garde anywhere yet. Neither in England, nor France, nor Belgium, nor Holland, nor, if I am well informed, in most the Scandinavian countries. There are only a few "Eclaireurs" who, as yet, do not agree about the course that is to be followed.‡* A terrible lie is: "The period of propaganda is past."

No, Comrade, this period is just beginning for Western Europe. There is no firm kernel anywhere as yet.

What we need here is this very kernel, firm as steel, clear as crystal. And this is where we should begin herewith to build up a big organisation. In this respect we are here in the stage in which you were in 1903, or even before, in the period of the Iskra. Comrade, the conditions, the relations here are far more ripe than we are, but that is no reason why we should let ourselves be carried away, to begin without a kernel!

For the time being we of Western Europe, the Communist parties in England, France, Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, Italy, even the K.A.P.D. in Germany, must remain small, not because we like to, but because otherwise we cannot become strong.

An example: Belgium. Except for Hungary, before the revolution, there is no country where the proletariat is as much corrupted by reformism as Belgium. If at this moment Communism should become a mass-movement there (with parliamentarism, etc.), the vultures, the profiteers, etc., of opportunism would at once swoop down upon it, and drag it into destruction. And it is the same everywhere.

For that reason, because the Labour movement here is very weak as yet, and almost altogether entrapped in opportunism, because so far Communism is hardly anything yet, we must build up a small kernel, and must fight (in the questions of parliamentarism and the Trades Unions, and in all others), until we attain the utmost lucidity and clearness, until everything has been made as clear as possible theoretically.

A sect, therefore, says the Executive Committee. Certainly, a sect, if thus you wish to call the kernel of a movement that conquers the world!

(To be continued.)

‡‡ In Halle, one day alone, 500,000 new members came under leaders which only a short while before they themselves had recognised to be worse than the Scheidemann lot. And in Tours three-quarters of the French Socialist Party joined, which until quite recently were for the greater part social-patriots.

*† Comrade Pannekoek, who thoroughly knows Germany, had predicted this. If the leaders of the Spartacus League would be placed before the choice between Parliament and Revolution, they would choose Parliament.

‡* The English Communists for instance, with regard to the most important matter of affiliation to the Labour Party.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Czecho-Slovakia in the World Revolution.

On May 15th and 16th the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia will be founded. A long process, rich in dramatic events, reaches its turning-point. The movement, which had its rise in the Southern districts, has now reached the centre of the country, and so the southern part will lose its original importance. The natural position is here. The Czech proletariat is marching at the head of the proletariat of Czecho-Slovakia.

What is now the part which the Republic has to play in the World Revolution?

Upon the answer to this question hangs—so we think—the Communist Party in Czecho-Slovakia.

The Czecho-Slovak Republic is a conquering State. It has a population of almost fourteen millions, whose chief occupation is industrial and agricultural. The Republic has inherited the greatest treasures of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Abundance of sugar, coal, iron, and a first-rate textile industry are amongst those annexed; also salt and timber. The Republic suffers from one thing only: Capitalism. And capitalist anarchy has produced a terrible crisis in production.

The Republic is surrounded by a number of revolutionary-disposed provinces: The Dombrovcer coalfields, Upper Silesia, Saxony, Central Germany in the north and West, Austria in the south, the Ukraine Galicia in the north-east and the revolutionary peasants of Horthy-Hungary in the south-east: this is the position of Czecho-Slovakia. Here if anywhere a "reliable" and consolidated gendarmerie is needed as an emergency door for capitalism. Not in vain were the Czech social-patriots the favourites even of France in the blackest days of the clerical monarchists. Prague and Czecho-Slovakia hold the key of the future of Central Europe.

From this is unrolled the part of the republic in the world revolution. In the Central European sector of the world revolution Czecho-Slovakia is active in the lead. The objective preliminary conditions are given. The subjective preliminaries are furthered in a great measure through just those facts, that it is a victorious State and victorious nation, whose proletariat is now being forced to tread the path of revolution. The self-consciousness of the conqueror must work out its effects in the scare of the revolution, just as the revolution in Austria and Germany had amongst other things to stumble up against defeatism.

Regarded from an outside point of view, a Czecho-Slovak Soviet Republic would attract to herself the revolutionary-minded border States. The proletariat of Upper Silesia, Central Germany, Saxony, of the Dombrovcer coalfields, of the petroleum district of Eastern Galicia would form the support which has been broken since the retreat of the Red Army from Warsaw. A federation with a Hungarian peasant republic delivered from Horthy's thugs would make the agrarian hinterland for this industrial key to Central Europe.

Newspaper Forgeries.

It seems that new forgeries of Russian papers are being circulated. British radios mentioned alleged information published in Russian papers about the presumed defeat of Soviet troops in Siberia by insurgents. No Russian papers have given any such news and no such defeats have taken place. It is a new invention and these quotations are obviously forgeries. There is also new talk of alleged travels of Trotsky. This is also pure invention. Trotsky is not travelling at present. These lies are fabricated in order to attribute to the Russian Government offensive designs which it does not have.

No Wire to Ireland.

Litvinov sent no telegram to Ireland. Information about this pretended telegram is absolutely false. British capitalist journals have recently publish pretended information about certain communications between Moscow and Ireland. All this is pure invention. It is a new campaign of lies intended to harm the trade agreement.

Liars' G.H.Q.

"Helsinkin Sanomato" writes: We have often referred to the lying telegrams which are sent to foreign countries from Helsingfors. We do not know the source of these telegrams, but they reduce the reputation of our land in foreign countries. An American paper calls Helsingfors the chief centre of the professional liars.

Trade with China.

"Krassnaja Gazeta" reports from Chita: A Chinese paper reports that the Chinese Government has decided to send Simpson, their specialist, to Russia in order to negotiate a treaty similar to the Anglo-Russian treaty. "Krassnaja Gazeta" reports from Chita: According to reports from Chinese sources the Chinese Government has informed the direction of the East China Railway that in any case the commercial relations with Russia will be resumed sooner or later, and that a definite time must be set for the departure of the goods purchased in China for Soviet Russia.

PERSIAN ATTACK ON BRITISH TRADE.

"The Times" of Saturday, May 21st, under the above headlines, published some remarkable statements from their special correspondent in the Middle East. There are some very pertinent remarks and observations that we think Communists everywhere should note, and we give them with our own comment.

"The Times" says: "The Persian Government has cancelled the concession to the Persian Transport Company, a *well-known British concern* (the italics are ours, as a comment on the name Persian, when owned by British).

"The action has caused considerable excitement here. . . . The cancellation of the concession is a direct challenge to British commercial interests."

According to the article it would seem that "the Government (Persian) shows marked appreciation of British advice in the reorganisation of the Ministries of Finance and War, but the newspapers criticise the employment of British officials in these important departments as provacative to Russia and dangerous to Persian independence" (well said in view of the fate of India) "and continue to demand the recall of Mr. Morgan Sluster" (well known to the students of Persia's history since and before the British concessions) "from the United States to resume control of Persian finances."

Under the sub-head "Soviet Policy," "The Times" says "the attitude of the Moscow Government towards the employment of foreign capital in Persia has been defined as follows: No Russian subject will be permitted to be a concessionaire in Persia." It is further pointed out that the Persian Government must resume possession of the former Russian Government's enterprises, and all private enterprises of Russian shareholders.

Now the last part of the article to which we would draw special attention and which, with its sub-heading, we give as published in "The Times," is as follows:—

"ALTERED CIRCUMSTANCES.

"In view of the importance of the British interests involved, I wish to utter a serious warning. British capital should read the signs of the times here, and not suppose that British interests can any longer be maintained in Persia either by the old methods or by Imperial bluff. Although the cancellation of the Lynch concessions cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged, the present Persian Government, which has attempted to do this, has already imprisoned some 200 Persian aristocrats, cancelled the Anglo-Persian Agreement, made Teheran go "dry," and provided almshouses for its innumerable street beggars, is a portent which the wise man will ponder.

"British interests can be maintained here, but not by the old methods nor by entire reliance on conveniently-worded documents purchased from financially embarrassed monarchs or politicians in the past."

As we quote from "The Times," we feel safe from attention by Scotland Yard, but let each reader carefully note the "Imperial bluff"—and the fact that words "imprisoning of 200 Persian aristocrats," and "making Teheran go 'dry,'" and "providing almshouses for street beggars," are portents which the wise man will ponder.

WHY THE NEW RUSSIA MUST WIN.

In your article with the significant title "The Future World War.—Act. I.", I noticed with some surprise that Lloyd George has been saying some nice things concerning Russia.

"What evil have I done that this bad man speaks well of me," is a quotation that comes into one's mind as I read his words.

However, some of his words are literally true; but not in the sense he means them. These are the words I refer to: "That country (Russia) is not going to remain as it is; that country is going to be a *dominant* country." Assuredly so!

The teaching of history on its economic basis goes to show that the greater the freedom of humanity the greater is its productive power, and the greater its weal the more dominant are they in world affairs.

As an illustration of what I mean, we will take the United States of America.

In the south, the wealth was mostly produced by "chattel slavery," whereas in the Northern States where men were freer the wealth was produced by wage slavery; hence wealth was more abundant.

Just as the two systems could not live side by side in America, neither can the Capitalist System live side by side with the Workers' Republic of Russia.

In this connection it is interesting to note what Sylvia Pankhurst says in her very informing narrative. "Soviet Russia as I saw it in 1920," in the last instalment of May 21st:—"Soviet Russia continually hopes and strives for peace with the capitalist aggressors; but it knows that such a peace could be no more than an armed truce, and that whilst Communist and Capitalists governments exist side by side, war may break out at any moment."

Remember there is no unemployment in Russia. Ah! says some, it is one huge chain of slavery. Are not all able-bodied people *forced* to work?

These people forget that in order to live somebody MUST work, and they have not the slightest idea that in Capitalist England the mass of people are only *free* to *starve*, and if they wish to work they must work on their masters' terms; even then the master, however kind-hearted he may be, has not always the power to give them work.

Probably to most of the readers of the "Dreadnought" it is plain that Soviet Russia is more free, hence produces greater wealth, so that sooner or later Russia must become a dominant factor in Europe.

Tolstoi says somewhere that Russia would not proceed far along the capitalist road on account of the spiritual outlook of her people, but that she would soon discover her mistake and she would turn, and, as a result of her turning, one of the first things she would do would be to free the land, and, by making the land the property of the community as a whole, instead of that of individuals, she was bound to lead the world.

I would like to draw the reader's attention to Eugene Varga's article in April 16th issue—an article well worth reading and re-reading, so important it is and very far-seeing.

Eugene Varga says:—

"In general it is quite right that the raising of production must have as a result the improvement of the position of the workers and all members of society.

"That is literally correct for present-day Russia; but applied to anarchistic capitalist economics, this principle means overproduction, economic crises, *unemployment*.

In capitalist society an increase of production means nothing more than that each producer or producing group increases the output of their own products without in the least inquiring whether these products are in demand."

Yes, it all points to what Lloyd George says: that Russia will become the "dominant factor"; but to do this she must continue as a workers' republic, and seeing that the whole weight of the Capitalist World have been intriguing for her downfall for the last three years without success, it seems certain that it is now Russia's turn to dominate.

Having thrown off the enormous waste of labour involved in the capitalist system—which is entirely eliminated under the Communist system—it is easy to see that Soviet Russia must win even though we do not see the immediate fruits.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY IN SOVIET RUSSIA.

By A. M. Lyubovich.

In spite of the fact that Russia has been completely isolated for two years, and Russian syndicalists have been cut off by the blockade from contact with the technical science of the West, Soviet Russia made great progress in wireless telegraphy.

Previous to the October Revolution, wireless apparatus was under the supervision of the Ministry of War, and was employed exclusively for war purposes. Following the October Revolution, a special decree of the Council of People's Commissars provided for the transfer of all radio stations, excluding portable outfits, into the hands of the People's Commissariat for Posts and Telegraph.

Beginning with that period, the application of wireless telegraphy was put on a basis utterly unknown in former times. Having in view the supreme importance of the political education of the wide masses of peasants and workmen, the People's Commissariat of Posts and Telegraph undertook to install a widely spread system of radio stations embracing vast areas of the country. Wireless operators were sent to all the provincial towns and the work of installation was carried on at full speed under the direct supervision and guidance of the central authorities and with the sympathetic co-operation of the Wireless Operators' Union. The larger towns were provided with radio stations first, then came the smaller towns, and towards the middle of the second year of this work of construction radio stations were installed even in the villages.

Number of Wireless Stations.

Throughout Soviet Russia there are to-day 250 radio receiving stations, in addition to 47 stations belonging to the War Department, which are at the disposal of the Commissariat of Post and Telegraph. This makes a wireless system of about 300 units, which is the most powerful information agency on the Continent. The number of radio transmitting stations, excluding those on ships, is 47, which puts Soviet Russia first on the list of European countries in this respect.

Thus radio telegraphic tentacles are now reaching out from the centre to the most distant and remote corners of the Republic. Untrammeled wireless telegraphy afforded the possibility of maintaining close communication between the cities and provinces surrounded by the enemy, where the encouraging messages coming from the centre and carried through the air-waves all over the vast area of Russia, were spread through the local press and the posters of the Russian Telegraph Agency, imbuing confidence, enthusiasm and strength in the hearts of the fighters.

During the civil war wireless telegraphy did excellent service. It enabled the Soviet Government to keep in constant touch not only with Tashkent, Uralsk, Baku and the Ukraine, but also with Soviet Hungary and with Germany, and afforded the opportunity of intercepting wireless messages from the hostile camps of Paris, England, Italy and Constantinople.

Civil and Military Uses.

Thus reconstructed on a new basis and brought home to the wide masses of peasants and workmen wireless telegraphy became a powerful agency of propaganda and agitation in the hands of the Soviet Government. The installation of wireless stations and the development of wireless communication would proceed at a much greater speed if it were not for the necessity of diverting the most skilled workers and most of the equipment for the needs of the war, and were it not that the production of wireless equipment does not keep pace with the work of installation.

The present abnormal conditions, when the workman, holding the hammer in one hand, must grasp the rifle with the other, are unfavourable for constructive work. Nevertheless the Council of Labour and Defence has issued a decree providing for the extension of the wireless stations.

The transatlantic station built in the vicinity of Moscow will be able to send waves all over the globe. It possesses an alternator of a new type of very high frequency—twenty thousand original motions a second. Apart from its wide possibilities as an agency of information, it will also produce extensive reforms in the matter of measuring longitude for purposes of navigation and surveying. There is no doubt that the colossal power of this station will compel the radio stations of other countries to adapt themselves to it. It will also provide extensive material and possibilities for the study not only of wireless telegraphy but also of atmospheric and magnetic phenomena, thus becoming an object of interest not only for Russia but also for foreign scientists.

All the work of calculation and construction connected with the alternator for this station has been accomplished by the Wireless Laboratory of Nizhnegorod. The inventor of the apparatus, engineer Volodkin, in a member of the Laboratory Council. This wireless laboratory was opened at the end of 1918 and in this brief period it has succeeded in making considerable contributions of great scientific value. It is engaged in the preparation of a new type of intensification which has hitherto been imported from France. By order of the Council of Defence the laboratory started upon the preparation of a number of radio-telephonic stations through the application of positive relay. A model of this has been worked out by engineer M. A. Bonch-Bruyevich, one of the specialists working in the laboratory.

The Wireless Telephone.

Moscow already has a radio-telephonic station of this type which can carry the human voice over a distance of over 3000 miles. The Chita station has reported that it has heard voice messages from Moscow. Similar reports have been received from Irkutsk Tashkent and Semipalatinsk. The author of these lines, assisted by the Ministry of Posts and Telegraph, carried on experiments in Berlin to establish the possibility of carrying the human voice from that city and Moscow. The main wireless station of Gelthoff was placed at our disposal for that purpose. The investigation was carried on in the presence of Count Orko, one of the most prominent scientists and inventors in the sphere of wireless telegraphy; Dr. Ruhkopf, the chief of the experimental station of the "Telefunken Co."; Dr. Gruznichka, a physicist who had come from London by invitation of Comrade Krassin, and the engineers and technicians of the Gelthoff station. At the appointed hour we heard Moscow saying "hello," and the conversation that followed was so distinct that I could recognise the voices of the persons speaking from Moscow. The impression produced was overwhelming. One of those present said to me: "How was it possible to achieve such wonderful progress in a country, where, as our newspapers inform us, everything is in a state of destruction and anarchy? Whom are we to believe after this?" I advised him to believe the facts.

The German Ministry of Posts and Telegraph being greatly interested in the experiment, ordered its laboratory expert, Engineer Vrazka, to verify it. As a result it was established that the audibility is sufficient for carrying on regular telephonic communication between Berlin and Moscow. Even reducing the power to one half it is possible to carry the human voice over the distance between Berlin and Moscow. This leads to the conclusion that the conversation from Moscow was heard by all the most important radio stations in Europe, a fact which was actually confirmed by messages received a few days after that from some European stations.

Thus the experiment in wireless telephony has proved a complete success, and this is the result of the scientific labours of the Soviet experts during the two years of their complete isloation from their colleagues in the West.

The radio telephonic station in Moscow is entirely the work of the Soviet Government. It has been installed and equipped by Soviet workers from the simplest screw to the most complicated apparatus.

COMPLIMENTARY BREAKFAST.

It was a larger company than that of those who actually sat down at the table which greeted Comrade Pankhurst at the breakfast given to her on the drizzly morning of her release. The absentees—some in prison, others kept away by the slender purse of unemployment or by the factory whistle—were nevertheless there in spirit, and to these, too, go our thanks.

The breaking of bread and the partaking of salt with the returning friend and comrade is an ancient custom: it signifies comradeship, community of interests, and unity of purpose.

A De Vincian figure at the long table of the quaint Eustace Miles' Restaurant, pale, frail, yet flushed with happiness at being out of prison and amongst friends, Comrade Pankhurst spoke briefly of her prison life, without hatred, in a voice mellowed by sorrow.

In years to come these little personal, almost insignificant incidents—now lost in the great class-struggle going on around us—will come back to us, bright under the light of memory.

The small, almost devotional party which last Monday sat at that breakfast, ere years are numbered many, will see its faith, its hopes accepted and shared by thousands who are now distant or hostile.

Wagedom and Capitalism will go.

A society based on justice and work will be established: Communism.

We shall reach it—by a road along which many will falter and fall.

Yet we shall reach it.



OUR BOOKSHELF.

"PARLIAMENT AND DEMOCRACY."

(By J. Ramsay Macdonald. The National Labour Press, Manchester and London. 75 pp. 2s. 6d. net.))

Ramsay Macdonald is a past-master in gentle Lapalissian art of writing, with the smooth outlook of a superficial mind, on things that no longer matters.

He assumes the pose of a debater and argues on subjects which are now passed and accepted by common agreement and by the general trend of public opinion.

He poses as an advanced Socialist, and, totally unaware of doing so, he displays a bourgeois mentality, vaguely coloured by moderate Liberalism.

He sees Parliament as a permanent institution, and, what is worse, talks about it theoretically, in a detached, schoolmaster way, even forgetting its own personal experience of the intrigues carried on at the House.

There is no sign of class-consciousness in this book of 75 pages, written by the Secretary of the Second-and-a-Half International, and intellectual leader of our programmeless Labour Party.

He so misreads the purposes of the Communist Party that he writes:

"The 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' as used in Russia, though not used by Marx, is far more akin to the spirit of old-fashioned Toryism with the House of Lords as its citadel than it is to popular government."

It is obviously unjust to judge a book by a sentence, but the above in the closing chapter, "Towards Democracy," is characteristic of the spirit that animates both the book under review and its author.

"YOUNG WORKERS" MOVEMENT.

LONDON.

Camberwell.—Branch recently formed. Members badly needed. Secretary: A. E. Cotton, 65, Pellatt Road, S.E. 22.

Southwark.—Meets at 4, Browning Street (late York Street), Walworth Road. Active members badly needed. Full particulars from the Secretary, J. F. Daly, at the same address.

Wembley.—Meets at 24, Copland Road, Wembley, Middlesex. Tennis and Cycling. Secretary: F. A. W. Gillies.

Leeds.—A further amalgamation brings us another branch. Lectures, classes, etc. Full particulars from the Secretary, G. Bloom, 32, Elmwood Street, Leeds.

Prospective members residing in any of the above districts, please communicate with local secretary.

Branches to be started at Croydon, Fulham,, Kentish Town and Poplar. Comrades desiring to join please communicate with the National Organiser, Young Workers' League, "The Young Worker" Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

Comrades willing to assist in formation of branches in other districts, or having information regarding possibilities of forming same, please communicate as above also.

BADGES.

SOVIET ARMS, in gilt on red enamel, 1s. 3d. and 9d. each, 12s. and 6s. per dozen.—Apply, Manager, "Workers' Dreadnought," 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

FURNISHED FRONT ROOM for two or three TRUE Communists. Library in different languages at disposal.—58, Fortess Road, Kentish Town, N.W.

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