

Russian Workers' Opposition in 4th International.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by
SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. IX. No. 12.

SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1922.

[WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST.

In northern climes the polar bear
Protects himself with fat and hair,
Where snow is deep and ice is stark,
And half the year is cold and dark;
He still survives a clime like that
By growing fur, by growing fat.
These traits, O bear, which thou transmittest
Prove the Survival of the Fittest.

To polar regions waste and wan
Comes the encroaching race of man,
A puny, feeble, little bubber.
He has no fur, he has no blubber.
The scornful bear sat down at ease
To see the stranger starve and freeze;
But lo! the stranger slew the bear,
And ate his fat and wore his hair;
These deeds, O man, which thou committest,
Prove the Survival of the Fittest.

In modern times the millionaire
Protects himself as did the bear;
Where Poverty and Hunger are
He counts his bullion by the car;
Where thousands perish still he thrives—
The wealth, O Cæsar, thou transmittest
Proves the Survival of the Fittest.

But lo! some people odd and funny,
Some men without a cent of money—
The simple, common human race
Chose to improve their dwelling place; they had
No use for millionaires,
They calmly said the world was theirs,
They were so wise, so strong, so many,
The millionaires?—there wasn't any.
These deeds, O man, which thou committest,
Prove the Survival of the Fittest.

CHARLOTTE STETSON.

THE BELFAST OUTRAGES FRAUD.

The most outrageous and blatant fraud on a credulous public that has ever taken place is the Government's present pretence that the Nationalist population of the six Ulster counties have risen to a state of dangerous unrest. The unfortunate Nationalist population of those counties amounts to but 25 per cent. of the total.

Day after day, week after week, month after month, there appeared even in the Unionist papers accounts of barbarous outrages perpetrated upon these unfortunate Sinn Féiners and Catholics; and then, suddenly, though there have been but few insignificant cases of retaliation, it is announced that the victims of the barbarities are a source of tremendous danger, and it is seen that Ulster has become an armed camp in order to deal with them.

Examine these facts:—

IN NATIONALIST IRELAND.

Not a single case of persecution or interference with the Protestant Loyalist minority has occurred. This has been testified to by Protestant meetings in the southern counties, which have expressed abhorrence of the outrages perpetrated on Catholic Sinn Féiners in the six north-eastern counties.

IN THE SIX NORTH-EASTERN COUNTIES.

From July 1920 to April 1922, 380 Nationalists (mostly Catholics) were murdered in Belfast and 1,421 persons were wounded by the Orange "Loyalists."

Between February 27th and April 28th, 1922, in Belfast,

95 Sinn Féiners were murdered.

157 Sinn Féiners were wounded.

75 houses occupied by Sinn Féiners were burned and looted.



The Breakdown of our Industrial System.

104 Sinn Féin families were evicted.

34 Sinn Féin families were rendered homeless.

During the same period, in Belfast no Loyalist families were rendered homeless; no Loyalist houses were burned and looted.

Eight thousand Catholics have been expelled from their employment in North-East Ulster. Mr. Ronald McNeill, a Unionist member of Parliament, callously defended this in the House of Commons, saying: "They were driven out because they were, or believed to be, Sinn Féiners."

From the signing of the pact between Mr. Collins, of the Southern Provisional Government, and Sir James Craig, of the North-Eastern Parliament, on April 1st, and the end of April,

21 Catholic Nationalists (14 men, 3 women, and 4 children) were murdered in Belfast.

There were 27 attempted murders of Sinn Féiners.

39 Sinn Féiners were wounded.

75 Sinn Féin houses were looted and burned.

357 Sinn Féiners were rendered homeless.

From July 21st, 1920, to May 28th, 1922, 20,000 Catholics have been driven from home.

Here is a record of ten days' doings.

May 10th.—A crowd of "Loyalists" returning from a football match opened fire into a Catholic Nationalist quarter in Oldpark Road. At the same time a bomb was thrown into a yard in Glenview Street, wounding two women—Mrs. Toner, aged 60, and Mrs. Tierney, aged 33. Both women are Catholics, and were removed

to the Mater Hospital. Continuous sniping from "Loyalist" areas into Catholic Streets took place up to curfew hour.

May 11th.—James Smith, aged 14 years, 42 Mayfair Street, wounded in the head on April 10th, died this morning.

May 11th.—At 2.30 a.m. this morning a party of "B" Specials smashed the window and pane's of the door of James McShane's house, 21 Gibson Street, in a vain attempt to get in. The inmates were terror-stricken during the attack, which lasted ten minutes.

May 12th.—A gang of "Loyalist" snipers again attacked the district of Marrowbone (the fifth evening in succession). One of the sharpshooters fired into a group of little girls who were playing in Gracehill Street, wounding May Mahony, 11 years of age!

May 13th.—A "Loyalist" mob threw a bomb into the house of Patrick Kinney, Palmer Street. The kitchen was wrecked. On Sunday, when Kinney was removing his furniture, shots were fired at the vanmen, while four special constables were standing by.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

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

The high cost of production of the paper necessitate prompt payment

May 13th.—A fire occurred in the oil store of Messrs. James, Gt. Patrick Street. Sinn Feiners in the neighbourhood rescued the horses from the neighbouring stables. A force of "Specials" arrived when the men were rescuing the horses. The Commandant of the Specials assaulted one of these men, striking him on the stomach with the butt of a revolver, and ordered him away. The man resented this, and was arrested. The Specials then opened fire into St. Patrick Street, with the result that a girl was killed and John McGrogan, Catholic Nationalist, Nelson Street, was wounded.

May 14th.—A number of "Loyalist" gunmen took up positions at the Shankhill Road end of Townsend Street, and opened rapid fire towards Divis Street. A woman named Lizzie MacAloney, of Melbourne Street, was wounded, and died half-an-hour after admission to hospital.

May 14th.—An armoured car came into Smithfield Square at 8 p.m., and for some unexplained reason fired at a number of men standing at the corner of West Street—an entirely Catholic locality. One of the men, P. O'Reilly, Eliza Street, was wounded in the thigh. The plate-glass windows of Messrs. McGuinness's clothing establishment, and of Tully's, jeweller, were riddled with bullets from this car.

The following notice was sent to Protestant farmers of the district of Magherafelt, Co. Derry, who have engaged Catholic labourers. In many cases the notice has been complied with:—

"You are hereby required within 48 hours after the service of this notice to clear out of your employment all Sinn Feiners and Roman Catholics. Herein fail not at the peril of your life.—By order."

The local "Loyalist" police have made no attempt to remove these placards!

May 16th.—Wm. Owen Madden, aged 21, Catholic Nationalist, whilst unloading fruit in a shop, was shot dead by "Loyalist" assassins, who were accompanying a funeral.

THE MURDERERS ESCAPED!

May 17th.—Catholic girls returning from work were attacked by "Loyalist" gunmen. Two girls, Maggie Hanvey and Nellie M'Mullan, were shot, and were removed to hospital, where Nellie M'Mullan succumbed to her injuries.

THE MURDERERS ESCAPED!

May 18th.—Two Sinn Feiners, McPeak and McDonagh, were shot dead whilst seated on a tramcar. Assassins shot them through the back.

THE MURDERERS ESCAPED!

May 18th.—A young man was shot dead on a tramcar by a man on a passing bus.

THE MURDERER ESCAPED!

May 18th.—Two men boarded a tram and, without parley, shot a young Catholic Nationalist named Caffrey.

THE ASSASSINS ESCAPED!

May 18th.—Wm. McKnight, passing through Exchange Street, was shot in the abdomen, and died a few hours later.

May 18th.—A young woman was wounded dangerously in Grosvenor Road, and two other women were fired at and wounded in York Street district.

THE ASSAILANTS ESCAPED!

May 19th.—In the village of Magherafelt, Co. Derry, four Catholic Nationalists, Hy. McGeehan and James McGeehan, brothers, and John and Francis Higgins, brothers, were dragged from their beds and shot dead.

THE ASSASSINS ESCAPED!

May 19th.—Houses of Catholic Nationalists set on fire—two burned to the ground; a corn-mill also totally destroyed.

THE PERPETRATORS ESCAPED!

May 20th and 21st.—Twelve persons killed, eleven wounded in Belfast. One of the victims, James McKenna, Catholic, was actually shot whilst at prayer in the church.

THE MURDERERS ESCAPED!

THE CAUSE AND THE GUILT.

Sinn Fein contends that the North-East Ulster outrages do not arise from unorganised mob-violence and spontaneous ignorant racial or religious intolerance. Sinn Fein claims that the outrages are officially organised by the police force of Sir James Craig's Government, in pursuance of his deliberate policy of expelling or exterminating the Nationalist population of the six Ulster counties, in order that the counties

may consist of a people homogeneous in its support of Loyalist principles and the maintenance of the British-Ulster ascendancy over the rest of Ireland.

It is pointed out that the enormous forces at the disposal of Sir James Craig in his little domain of six little counties, include the following:—

3,000 Constabulary armed and equipped by the British Government.

5,000 "A" Specials " " "

20,000 "B" Specials " " "

An undefined number of "C" Specials " " "

19 battalions of British Crown forces.

The Sinn Fein *Irish Bulletin* makes the following allegations:—

"Only Irish Nationalists are attacked by the 'Specials'."

"The English military assist the 'specials'."

"The cars, rifles, bombs, and petrol used are Government property."

"Looting and burning takes place under the eyes of the police and military."

"No loyalist is punished or arrested for arson or murder."

Here are a few cases cited in the *Irish Bulletin* which illustrate the behaviour of the police and military:—

"The house of Patrick O'Connor, 64 Unity Street, Carrick Hill area, was raided at 10 p.m. on May 1st by a mixed force of Military, R.I.C., and Specials. The raiding party pulled up the bedroom floors, pulled out windows, ripped up sofas, pictures on the walls were damaged, and an altar was destroyed. Nothing incriminating was found."

"During the attack on Antigua Street by the mob on Tuesday, April 18th, petrol was given to them by the 'Specials' from the 'cage' lorries, and Military on armoured cars, to burn the houses. Soldiers and Specials rolled barrels of stout down into Louisa Street from Mrs. Donnelly's public-house in Antigua Street, which was looted before being set on fire."

"During the time the houses in Antigua Street were blazing, the unfortunate Catholic Nationalists in the streets adjoining were subjected to bursts of machine-gun and rifle fire from Specials in 'cage' lorries who patrolled these streets."

"There were five cages of Specials, one whippet armoured car, a lorry full of soldiers, and a military armoured car on duty that day in the district of 'Marrowbone,' but these forces did not prevent the 'Loyalist' mob from burning, looting, and wrecking the houses of 49 Sinn Fein families there."

"On the same day and the day following, 37 more families were driven from their homes on the other side of Oldpark Road, opposite Marrowbone, by the 'Loyalist' mob. A 'Loyalist' band paraded the streets of this district playing 'party' airs, and was followed by a huge crowd loaded with loot. They passed the police and military unmolested."

"The *Times* states that:—

'Nationalists having complained as to the lack of protection afforded to Catholics in the Marrowbone area, the district was eventually placed under military control, but even this precaution did not stop the burning of houses and the looting of shops.'

"A number of Class 'C' Ulster Specials, armed with rifles, rushed into the Thompson Street district (Catholic) and opened fire."

"The few military on the scene tried to cope with the fusillade by the Unionists and Class 'C' Specials."

"The officer in charge was approached to have the Specials removed, and he agreed that if they were put out of the district peace would soon be restored, but he could not get them removed."

"When he withdrew his small force of troops later, there followed cold-blooded murders of a horrifying type. The worst example was the killing of Patrick McGoldrick, in 27 Madrid Street. Mr. McGoldrick was ill in bed. The gunmen broke in the door, rushed upstairs, and hacked the unfortunate man with hatchets. Before leaving they fired several shots into the lifeless body."

"The *Times* states that:—

'Nationalists having complained as to the lack of protection afforded to Catholics in the Marrowbone area, the district was eventually placed under military control, but even this precaution did not stop the burning of houses and the looting of shops.'

"A number of Class 'C' Ulster Specials, armed with rifles, rushed into the Thompson Street district (Catholic) and opened fire."

"The few military on the scene tried to cope with the fusillade by the Unionists and Class 'C' Specials."

"The officer in charge was approached to have the Specials removed, and he agreed that if they were put out of the district peace would soon be restored, but he could not get them removed."

"When he withdrew his small force of troops later, there followed cold-blooded murders of a horrifying type. The worst example was the killing of Patrick McGoldrick, in 27 Madrid Street. Mr. McGoldrick was ill in bed. The gunmen broke in the door, rushed upstairs, and hacked the unfortunate man with hatchets. Before leaving they fired several shots into the lifeless body."

"The *Times* states that:—

'Nationalists having complained as to the lack of protection afforded to Catholics in the Marrowbone area, the district was eventually placed under military control, but even this precaution did not stop the burning of houses and the looting of shops.'

"A number of Class 'C' Ulster Specials, armed with rifles, rushed into the Thompson Street district (Catholic) and opened fire."

"The few military on the scene tried to cope with the fusillade by the Unionists and Class 'C' Specials."

"The officer in charge was approached to have the Specials removed, and he agreed that if they were put out of the district peace would soon be restored, but he could not get them removed."

"When he withdrew his small force of troops later, there followed cold-blooded murders of a horrifying type. The worst example was the killing of Patrick McGoldrick, in 27 Madrid Street. Mr. McGoldrick was ill in bed. The gunmen broke in the door, rushed upstairs, and hacked the unfortunate man with hatchets. Before leaving they fired several shots into the lifeless body."

"The *Times* states that:—

'Nationalists having complained as to the lack of protection afforded to Catholics in the Marrowbone area, the district was eventually placed under military control, but even this precaution did not stop the burning of houses and the looting of shops.'

"A number of Class 'C' Ulster Specials, armed with rifles, rushed into the Thompson Street district (Catholic) and opened fire."

"The few military on the scene tried to cope with the fusillade by the Unionists and Class 'C' Specials."

"The officer in charge was approached to have the Specials removed, and he agreed that if they were put out of the district peace would soon be restored, but he could not get them removed."

"When he withdrew his small force of troops later, there followed cold-blooded murders of a horrifying type. The worst example was the killing of Patrick McGoldrick, in 27 Madrid Street. Mr. McGoldrick was ill in bed. The gunmen broke in the door, rushed upstairs, and hacked the unfortunate man with hatchets. Before leaving they fired several shots into the lifeless body."

"The *Times* states that:—

'Nationalists having complained as to the lack of protection afforded to Catholics in the Marrowbone area, the district was eventually placed under military control, but even this precaution did not stop the burning of houses and the looting of shops.'

"A number of Class 'C' Ulster Specials, armed with rifles, rushed into the Thompson Street district (Catholic) and opened fire."

"The few military on the scene tried to cope with the fusillade by the Unionists and Class 'C' Specials."

Wilson would "be carried out to the full, regardless of cost or consequences." It should be remembered that Sir Henry Wilson is a well-known Orangeman. According to the *Daily News*, "He was one of the most prominent of the officers of the British Army, who, by backing the Caronite rebellion, paralysed the arm of the Government. He played an influential part behind the scenes in the promotion of the Black and Tan campaign."

Since the pact between the Republicans of the De Valera faction and the Collins the supporters of the Treaty, the outrages upon Sinn Feiners in the six north-eastern counties are more frequent. Sir James Craig's Government has issued a regulation that membership of the Irish Republican Army and other Sinn Fein organisations is illegal in the six counties, and Republicans are being arrested on wholesale lines: 204 of them were taken into custody in a single night.

Sir James Craig has announced that Britain has promised the aid of still more troops. These are to be used, he says, as follows:—

For resisting the invasion of northern territory.

For supporting the police outside Belfast.

Nevertheless, he told his little Parliament that the troops cannot prevent assassinations or arson, "their object being to assist the civil authorities, but not to do police duty." A cynical indication that of what assisting the civil authorities means in this case.

War between North and South Ireland seems to be drifting nearer. If it comes to war, the little north-eastern corner will be more than a match for the rest of Ireland in trained troops and military equipment, because British troops and munitions will be placed at its disposal.

Sir James Craig declares that his Government is not willing to deal with a Treaty-Republican Coalition, there will be no boundary commission, and there will be a complete rupture between the Northern and Southern Government.

The British Government may only be encouraging Ulster to get the Treaty ratified; or it may go further. The ratification of the Treaty by an Irish election would be a grim farce if it ever took place, for the choice before the Irish electorate would be this:—

Ratification of a hated treaty and peace with Britain, at least for the present; or

Rejection of the treaty and a war of extermination waged against you by the overwhelmingly superior naval and military forces of Britain.

On May 18th, Mr. Chamberlain, in the House of Commons, grandiloquently said of the alleged Turkish atrocities in Asia Minor:—

"His Majesty's Government, who have assumed a serious responsibility for future protection of minorities, cannot allow such incidents to continue unchecked."

The Irish, of course, call this hypocrisy. What do you say, fellow-workers?

THE MURDER OF CAMPANELLA. U.S.A. Police Methods.

The murder of John Campanella by police officials in an Illinois prison cell throws a striking light on American police methods. Campanella was a member of the United Mine Workers' Union, and the police were endeavouring to extract from him a confession of murder by what is called the "Third Degree," and is simply torture. Having tortured Campanella to death, the officials hung him, in the hope that his death would pass as one of suicide. A coroner's jury had actually given a verdict of suicide, but an autopsy performed at the instance of the widow proved that Campanella had not died of suicide, but of the tortures inflicted upon him. The Chief of Police, the Chief of Detectives, three detective-lieutenants, and four detective-sergeants have been reduced to the rank of patrolmen and suspended for 30 days for their part in the murder.

An ordinary citizen of U.S.A. would be sentenced to death by the electric chair for such a crime: these police officials are not even dismissed the force: they are merely degraded for their clumsiness for having killed an innocent man instead of getting him convicted and killed in a judicial manner.

THE BREAKDOWN OF OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

(Continued from last week.)

Of course, as long as society remains organised so as to permit the owners of the land and capital to appropriate for themselves, under the protection of the State and historical rights, the yearly surplus of human production, no such change can be thoroughly accomplished. But the present industrial system, based upon a permanent specialisation of functions, already bears in itself the germs of its proper ruin. The industrial crises, which grow more acute and protracted, and are rendered worse and still more acute by the armaments and wars implied by the present system, are rendering its maintenance more and more difficult. Moreover, the workers plainly manifest their intention to support no longer patiently the misery occasioned by such crises. And each crisis accelerates the day when the present institutions of individual property and production will be shaken to their foundations, with such internal struggles as will depend upon the more or less good sense of the now privileged classes.

But we maintain, also, that any Socialist attempt at remodelling the present relations between Capital and Labour will be a failure, if it does not take into account the above tendencies towards integration. Those tendencies have not yet received, in our opinion, due attention from the different Socialist schools; but they must. A re-organised society will have to abandon the fallacy of nations specialised for the production of either agricultural or manufactured produce. It will have to rely on itself for the production of food and cost of the raw materials; it must find the best means of combining agriculture with manufacture, the work in the field with a decentralised industry, and it will have to provide for "integrated education," which education alone, by teaching both science and handicraft from earliest childhood, can give to society the men and women it really needs.

Each nation her own agriculturist and manufacturer; each individual working in the field and in some industrial art; each individual combining scientific knowledge with the knowledge of a handicraft. Such is, we affirm, the present tendency of civilised nations. The following pages are intended to prove the first of these three assertions.

The prodigious growth of industries in Great Britain, and the simultaneous development of the international traffic which now permits the transport of raw materials and articles of food on a gigantic scale, have created the impression that a few nations of West Europe were destined to become the manufacturers of the world. They need only—it was argued—to supply the market with manufactured goods, and they will draw from all over the surface of the earth the food they cannot grow themselves, as well as the raw materials they need for their manufactures. The steadily increasing speed of transoceanic communications, and the steadily increasing facilities of shipping, have contributed to enforce the above impression. If we take the enthusiastic pictures of international traffic drawn in such a masterly way by Neumann-Spallart—the statistician and almost the poet of the world trade—we are inclined indeed to fall into ecstasy before the results achieved. "Why shall we grow corn, rear oxen and sheep, and cultivate orchards, go through the painful work of the labourer and the farmer, and anxiously watch the sky in face of a bad crop, when we can get with much less pain, mountains of corn from India, America, Hungary or Russia, meat from New Zealand, vegetables from France, apples from Canada, grapes from Malaga, and so on?" exclaim the West Europeans. "Already now," they say, "our food consists, even in modest households, of produce gathered from all over the globe. Our cloth is made out of fibres grown and wool sheared in all parts of the world. The prairies of America and Australia; the mountains and steppes of Asia; the frozen wilderness of the Arctic regions; the deserts of South Africa and the depths of the oceans; the tropics and the lands of the midnight sun have our tributaries. All races of man contribute their share in supplying us with our staple food and luxuries, with plain clothing and fancy dress, whilst we are sending them in exchange the produce of our higher intelligence, our technical knowledge, our powerful commer-

cial and organising capacities. Is it not a grand sight, this busy and intricate exchange of produce all over the earth, which has suddenly grown up within a few years?

Grand it may be, but is it not a mere nightmare? Is it necessary? Is it advantageous for humanity? At what cost has it been obtained, and how long will it last?

Let us turn seventy years back. France lies bleeding at the end of the Napoleonic wars. Her young industry, which has begun to grow by the end of the last century, is crushed down. Germany, Italy, are powerless on the industrial field. The armies of the great Republic have struck a mortal blow to serfdom on the Continent, but the return to reaction tries to revive the decaying institution, and serfdom means no industry worth speaking of. The terrible wars between France and this country, which wars are often explained by merely political causes, had a much deeper meaning—an economical meaning. They were wars for supremacy on the world-market, wars against France, commerce, and industry; and Britain won the battle. She became supreme on the seas. Bordeaux was no more a rival to London, and the French industries seemed to be killed in the bud. And, favoured by the powerful impulse given to natural sciences and technology by the great era of inventions, finding no serious competitors in Europe, Britain began to develop her manufactures. To produce on a large scale in immense quantities became the watchword. The necessary human forces were at hand in the peasantry, partly driven by force from the land, partly attracted to the cities by high wages. The necessary machinery was created, and the British production of manufactured goods went on at a gigantic pace. In the course of less than seventy years—from 1810 to 1878—the output of coal grew from 10 to 133 millions of tons; the imports of raw materials rose from 30 to 380 millions of tons; and the exports of manufactured ware from 46 to 200 million pounds. The tonnage of the commercial fleet was nearly trebled. Fifteen thousand miles of railways were built.

It is useless to repeat at what a cost the above results were achieved. The terrible revelations of the Parliamentary Commissions in 1840-42 as to the atrocious conditions of the manufacturing classes; the tales of "cleared estates," and those of the Indian "Mutiny" are still fresh in the memory. They will remain standing monuments for showing by what means the great industry was implanted in this country. But the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the privileged classes was going on at a speed never dreamed of before.

OIL.

In the week ending May 15th, nine tankers, all owned by the same company—the Anglo-Persian Oil Company—or by companies in which it has a large share, brought over 21,000,000 gallons of crude Persian oil to Swansea from Abadan. This constitutes a record. The import of oil in the first four months of 1922 was 103,461,000 gallons, an increase of 8,312,000 gallons over the corresponding quantity last year.

British capitalism is by no means bankrupt, although 2,000,000 British workers are unemployed. It is changing its theatre of operations; that is all. The miners will suffer from the change from coal to fuel oil; so will the boilermakers, the stokers, and many others. The workers are but pawns in the capitalist game. Yet they do not make up their minds to cease working to maintain the capitalists and devote their activities instead to the general welfare.

DREADNOUGHT £500 FUND.

Brought forward, £161 3s. 1d. Mrs. and Miss Chappelow, £1; C. Webb, 3/-; J. Lees, 2/-; C. R. Hammerton, 2/6; Hon. H. P. Jones, 6/8; H. Hersey, 10/-; H. Holt, 7/6; E. T. Sellek, 2/6; Per E. F. Dean, 10/-; W. Holdsworth, 2/6; G. Sear, Jun., 3/-. Total for week, £3 9s. 8d. Total, £164 12s. 9d.

WRIT ON COLD SLATE.

By E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

Price 1s. 7d., Post Free.

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.

By TOM ANDERSON.

COMMUNISM, A CHILD'S LESSON.

Communism in our land is yet very feeble, but grown-ups do not yet understand it. We have various parties who are on the road leading to it, but their vision is not very clear. They are afraid, more than incapable of understanding its message. Communism means a class-less State; a land in which there are no rich and no poor. If poverty were to enter there it would be the result of some great failure in Nature to give us the fruits of our labour. You must understand, girls and boys, that all we have in the world comes from Mother Earth, by our labour applied to it. To-day we have the power to produce a thousand-fold more than we require. If we had entered the land of Communism with the acquired knowledge that we have to-day, the working day would not exceed four hours per day. And in that time we would be able to produce a sufficiency for all.

Under Communism there would be no money. Everything you wanted would be yours by right. If you wanted clothes, you would simply go to the department store and select what you wanted, and it would be sent to you. All your foodstuff would be selected in the same way. Just as water is to-day supplied by our municipal councils practically free, so would be all the necessities of life. Our parks in our cities belong to the people. No one questions anyone's right to walk in them. Such an idea is undreamt of. Why? Because they belong to the people. So with Communism, everything would belong to the people, because the people were the possessors. To-day there is no people; there are only slaves and masters.

Of course great big questions are raised by the present possessors. When you say these things, they say you would be stealing their "capital," meaning that you would be doing something wrong. We tell them, however, that capital is but the surplus value taken from the worker, and that the worker has now awakened and refuses to hand over to anyone that which is called "capital." In our present "Class State," the workers generally "are beasts with muddy brains," because they have been up as "beasts." Even unto to-day they are housed and fed on a lower scale than the horses employed by our municipal councils.

In one city (Glasgow), 70,000 live in single-apartment houses. The one room they have is a sleeping apartment, a washhouse, a lavatory. All the cooking is done in it, the children are born in it, the children die in it. It is the entire mansion of four, five, six, seven or eight human beings, as the case may be, and this is the glory of your civilisation.

I have on several occasions been to a funeral of one of these victims of our civilisation. The corpse was placed on the table, quite close to the bed the children slept in. All the family took their meals off a chair alongside the corpse. They all washed and dressed themselves in this little 12 ft. by 10 ft. 6 in. mansion on earth, and knew no better because they were brought up as beasts; and beasts, as you may know, are not supposed to have any fine feelings.

The parson called and prayed with the mourners, and said it was God's will. (He was a liar, but that did not matter.) The beasts in the mansion believed what he said. He told them that Jesus died for them to save from their sins, and the beasts bowed their heads, and many of them shed tears. The preacher said: "In your Father's House are many mansions." "Lay not up treasures on this earth, where moth and dust shall destroy." And the beasts said "Amen." Then they took the corpse to a graveyard and had a drink and feed after they came back. Then the beasts went to bed. And this is life to-day!

Communism would end all this. You would all be equal to Princess Mary; and you, boys, to the Prince. So let us shout: "May it come soon!"

LEAKEY'S

INTRODUCTION TO ESPERANTO

La Lingvo Internacia

Price 4d., post free.

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

JUST OUT.

DESIRABLE MANSIONS.

By Edward Carpenter.

A TELLING SATIRE.

Price - 4d.

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

"WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" SHOW CARDS.

We have some small *Dreadnought* show cards with a fine decorative drawing in which the worker is depicted breaking the chains which bind the earth. These may be obtained from the *Dreadnought* office by those who will display them.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOUNDED 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

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

SUBSCRIPTION:

THREE MONTHS (13 weeks)	Post Free	3/3
SIX MONTHS (20 weeks)	"	6/6
ONE YEAR (52 weeks)	"	13/-

Vol. IX. No. 12. Saturday, June 3, 1922.

THE WORKERS' OPPOSITION IN RUSSIA.

The Workers' Opposition in Russia has now allied itself with the Communist Workers' Party (Fourth International). This is an event of first-class importance. It should show the Left Wing Communists, the real Communists, all over the world how the matter really stands. It should induce them to sit on the fence no longer, but to come out and throw in their lot with the genuine revolutionary movement: the movement which is working to establish some Reformist Half-Way House in which peace with capitalism will still be made, which will continue to strive and struggle for Communism, and the final end of the war of the classes.

The Workers' Opposition in Russia has sent to the Communist Workers' Party of Germany the following manifesto:—

FROM THE WORKERS' OPPOSITION IN RUSSIA
TO OUR FELLOW-ORGANISATION, THE K.A.P.D.,
COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY, FOR
PUBLICATION.

Comrades,—Even if we do not receive your newspapers regularly, and are therefore handicapped in our endeavours to get to know the true situation, nevertheless the copies that have come through to us put us in a position to form an idea of the immediate tasks which the Communist Workers' Party has set itself. We heartily greet the unanimous determination to set up the Fourth International as being the central body that will unify the genuinely proletarian forces of the revolution. It is just here in Moscow that we Russian comrades recognise most clearly the vital and urgent necessity of establishing the Labour International; indeed, we have realised that it is absolutely indispensable if the honest revolutionaries, the real Communists, are to be given an organisation that will not let itself be over-mastered by the Capitalists' International, but that will pursue its goal in a business-like way and with a clear knowledge of the right course. If at the present moment it amounts to the acceptance of the tactics of the Communist Labour Parties by only small portions of the working masses, it must not be supposed that it is a sign of unjustifiable boldness that there should already be a stand made against the Internationals which, together with their rational sections, are going to wreck and ruin in the backwaters of reconstruction. On the contrary, it must be considered as being the unmistakable expression of a determination to crystallise the Labour movement and get the workers capable of acting on their own. Even if this project cannot, and does not, at once assume a positive character, nevertheless, having thrown in our lot with you, and having left the social-democratic Russian Communist Party which has made business its chief concern, we Russian comrades are glad to find the support you offer. We remain in the hope that you will energetically build up the international connection and keep us well informed as to how things are developing.

"GROUP OF REVOLUTIONARY LEFT
COMMUNISTS (C.W.P.) OF RUSSIA."

Comrades desirous of building up the Communist Workers' Party in Britain should write to the Workers' Dreadnought Office without delay.

NEXT WEEK WE SHALL PUBLISH A STATEMENT BY THE REVOLUTIONARY LEFT WING COMMUNISTS OF RUSSIA, ON THE NECESSITY OF FOUNDING THE COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY.

BOTTOMLEY.

Mr. Bottomley, when sentenced to seven years' penal servitude, observed that, had he been given the opportunity, he would have had "something very offensive to say about the Judge's summing up."

We have been calling attention for some time past to the fact that it has now become the habitual practice for Judges to act as super-counsel for the prosecution, ramming home from his position of authority and so-called impartiality all the most telling points against the prisoner, and literally dragooning the juries into bringing in verdicts of "Guilty." Speeches of two, four, or even eight hours (it was 2½ in this case) have recently been made by Judges in summing up, and the Judge's indictment against the prisoner follows on the speech of the counsel for the prosecution. A day or more usually intervenes since the speech for the defence was made. The fact is that it is the Judge who tries the case in these days. If the Judge is against the prisoner there is no chance of an acquittal. This is clear to anyone who carefully examines the Judge's summing up, and especially the Judge's instructions to the jury in any of the recent notorious cases.

If Mr. Bottomley, in his capacity of editor and publicist, had taken up the question of court procedure and the function of the Judge in criminal trials before he was himself placed in the dock, it is possible that he might have been acquitted the other day.

He was evidently too busy locking after his private fortune to do that.

As to Bottomley's guilt or innocence, in this case we will express no opinion; he is appealing against his sentence.

Mr. Bottomley is an old man. Seven years in gaol, if it does not end him, will leave him only a broken creature ready to go his way quietly to his grave without further intrigue and bombast. It may appear strange that great masses of persons should have been found willing to invest in his Bond Clubs, for his career has been chequered with failures, bankruptcies, and charges of fraud, from which he has not always been able to extricate himself in the law courts. Yet we must not be surprised that hundreds of thousands of people have shown themselves gullible in this respect, since the masses in their millions uphold the capitalist system, which defrauds and exploits them throughout their lives.

In a better society than this Bottomley might not have become the vulgar blatant imposter that he is. He had ambitions of a calibre that is common to-day: he wanted to make a name for himself in the vulgar huckstering crowd, and to make much money. His abilities were not of the finest, but they fitted him to appeal to the shallow-mindedness which is a product of modern capitalism. Hence his success. Had he commenced life with a huge banking account, or come of one of the ruling families, Bottomley would not be where he is to-day. He was driven to all kinds of shifts because he wanted to be one of the rich without having come of the rich. No man can grow rich by his own exertions with even tolerable honesty to-day.

The harm that Bottomley has done as a reactionary influence, spreading false and foul doctrines amongst millions of people, and zealously supporting the capitalist system and its most evil features, is far greater than any of his financial frauds. The greatest of all his many sins is, perhaps, the one he boasted as a virtue:—

"I was the King's chief recruiting-sergeant."

In that great sin he was less blameworthy because he had less responsibility than the members of the Government who, in the interests of capitalism, and for their own glorification, cajoled and forced millions of men into the war.

Bottomley's action in robbing the soldiers, through his Bond Club, was not worse than that of the politicians who broke their promises in regard to pensions and the provision of work for the soldiers on discharge.

There are many more Bottomleys in the dark and sordid haunts of gambling and speculation where the periodicals which mould British public opinion are fabricated.

It should be observed that our rulers made use of Bottomley as a recruiting agent, and paid him as much as £200 a day for his lectures on the war, though he was just as fraudulent a fellow then as he is to-day. They have now finished with their tool.

SEAMEN OF SOVIET RUSSIA.

We are glad to learn that the seamen aboard the steamer *Karl Marx*, of Soviet Russia, which arrived at Hull the other day, are better paid than the crews of British vessels, and that the system of supplying inferior food to crew and third-class passengers does not obtain aboard the Soviet ships, there being only one food standard on board. We are glad to learn also that the question of providing proper accommodation for the crew is also receiving attention.

It is pleasing also to learn that the Soviet Russian seamen were indignant at hearing their conditions were said to be no better than those of British seamen.

There, however, the reasons for satisfaction end. The Russian seamen are still wage slaves, and are not even economically equal amongst themselves. There are still the old distinctions of pay on the old class lines. The class war still continues in Russia. Therein lies the need for the Workers' Opposition in Russia. There will continue the need for such a proletarian party in all countries until Communism is secured and a classless order of society replaces the present strife.

ESPERANTO.

A reader suggests that we should give some easily graduated readings with comments, followed later by a key.

We act at once upon this excellent suggestion, and will ask in return for an occasional postcard from learners to report progress; otherwise a feeling of lecturing to an empty room gets hold of the teacher at times.

EKZERKO No. 1.

Bonan tagon, Sinjorino, mi estas tre feliĉa vidanta vin, mi esperas ke vi estas tute sana kaj ankaŭ via filino. Ĉu vi povos viziti min morgaŭ por trinki teon ĉe mi kun via filino?

Multajn dankojn, Sinjoro, ni estus tre feliĉaj trinki teon ĉe vi. sed malfeliĉe morgaŭ ni estos okupataj; ĉu estus egale konvena al vi se ni venus je ia alia tago?

VORTARETO.

al to	morgaŭ to-morrow
alia other	multa much
ankaŭ also	okupa busy
bona good	por in order to
ĉe at, with	povi to be able

ĉu whether	sana healthy, well
dankoj thanks	teo tea
egale equally	tago day
ekzerko exercise	Sinjoro Sir
espero to hope	sed but
esti to be	se if
feliĉa happy	tre very
filo son	trinki to drink
ia some	tute quite
kaj and	veni to come
ke that	vi you
konvena convenient	vidi to see
kun with	viziti to visit
mi I	vortareto vocabulary

JE can be translated into English, as ON or AT or WITH; for instance, "on a certain day," "at a certain hour," "angry with someone," "laughing at someone," where a link is required of no particular meaning.

NOTES.

The learner must remember that all nouns end in O, and all adjectives in A, but are liable to the addition of N or J, to denote the objective case or the plural.

Thus BONAN is an adjective in the objective case, because there would be no sense in saying "Good day" unless you meant "I wish you a good day." You are not released from considering it to be objective because you leave out the first words.

You will not find Sinjorino in the vocabulary, but Sinjoro, meaning Sir; you know that IN between the R and the O makes it feminine, MADAM.

You will not find malfeliĉe, but you know that MAL reverses the meaning of a word; thus, if feliĉa means happy, the reverse is unhappy, and you also remember that a word ending in E is an adverb, and therefore Malfeliĉe means "unhappily."

Ĉu vi povos (whether you will be able) just means in English "Can you?" or "Shall you be able?"

IN PARLIAMENT.

GENOA.

The most striking feature of the Parliamentary debate in which Lloyd George made his Genoa statement was the clarity with which it revealed that all the parties in Parliament, not excluding the Labour Party, have but one policy in international affairs. That policy includes the maintenance of the capitalist system, the endeavour to make British capitalism supreme, and the determination to put British capitalist interests before every other consideration. The Labour Party simply echoes the other parties in these policies. The reason, partly, is that the Labour members believe the interests of the British worker to be bound up with those of his employer, and partly that the members of the Labour Party in Parliament are no longer of the working class: they have "got on" into the middle class, and they regard the class system and capitalism as permanent and inevitable. Some of them call themselves Socialists, but in reality they have never been converted to Socialism; they scarcely even know what it is, and have no belief in its ever coming to pass. But let us return to the debate.

Mr. Lloyd George several times told the House that the Governments of thirty-four nations were represented at Genoa. If such a conference had taken place in 1914, he said, there would have been no war. When Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy interjected that such a conference might have been held during the war or in 1918, he was howled down with cries of "Bad manners." Quite naturally, the knock-out-blow "fraternity did not wish to be reminded of its recent past, in these days of lip service to pacifism."

As to Russia, Mr. Lloyd George said that "without the assistance of the other thirty nations it was hopeless for Russia, whatever the Government, to extricate itself from what he called that pit of squalid misery." There were three possibilities, he said, to be considered in dealing with Russia: Firstly, war, which had been tried and failed. He was not reminded of the need to apologise for having adopted the war method because the members who formed his audience were upholders of capitalism and abhorers of Communism. No Labour member cried "Shame!"

The second alternative, he said, was "to leave Russia to her fate until she has a more benevolent and acceptable demeanour."

(No one challenged the arch-hypocrite on his ghoulish use of the word benevolent.)

The third alternative he described as "the policy of Mr. Pitt, the policy that abhorrence of the principles and conduct of a Government should not preclude relations with it which would enable you to deal with the people under its sway."

"We may be driven to adopt the second alternative," Lloyd George told his hearers, and again no one protested or dissented. He warned the House that leaving Russia alone might mean the fall of the Soviet Government, to be followed either by a more extreme Communist organisation or a militarist organisation. Moreover, he said, if Germany and Russia should still be treated as pariahs by the other Governments, they might become partners, and Germany might provide arms for Russia. Furthermore, he urged, Britain needs Russian produce and the Russian market. For these reasons, he said, the British delegation had fought "the battle of the peace of the world." It should be observed that the Prime Minister found it necessary to explain to the House that not pure altruism, but considerations of business interest, were the guiding motives which dictated the attitude of the British delegation. The House, being thoroughly convinced of that, gave him a cordial hearing.

He went on to observe that "Revolutions on a great scale always carry in their train confiscation of property without compensation." The French Revolution had done that, but France did not at the same time seek credits from the rich people of other countries. Russia, Lloyd George cynically observed, must have credit, and will not get it unless the Russians restore the confiscated properties, compensate the capitalists, assume responsibility for pre-revolutionary debts, and make capitalism in Russia secure for the

present. The Soviet Government knows this, says Lloyd George, and is prepared to be accommodating to capitalism. The "moderate men," he says, are anxious to be accommodating towards capitalism, but they do not want to say they are being so, because the Russian proletariat would object to that. They want, like Lloyd George himself (that is, according to his version), to say one thing and do another. Verbally, they want to maintain their revolutionary principles: in practice they are quite prepared to abandon them. Lloyd George applauds this attitude. If his version is correct, it seems to be once more a case of evil communications corrupting good manners, for the Bolsheviks prided themselves on open diplomacy and having no secrets from the international masses when they first came to power in Russia. According to Lloyd George, the deal with the accommodating Bolsheviks was proceeding quite nicely until the proletarian festival of May 1st came along to upset things. There was a struggle between the extremists and the moderates, and the extremists so far gained the upper hand as to make a mess of the Genoa negotiations. The workmen in the towns, who form the public opinion of Russia, insisted on adherence to revolutionary principle, and so the compromises that might have been made at Genoa are postponed to The Hague.

Lloyd George's versions are notoriously untrustworthy. It is a mistake to take them seriously. Though there are doubtless some truths interspersed in his remarks, he is obviously concealing and distorting many facts. The main reason why the Genoa pact was not cemented was that French and American capitalists were not prepared to let British capitalism have all its own way in Russia.

Unfortunately, the revolutionary industrial proletariat of Russia did not get the upper hand on May 1st, as Lloyd George pretends; the proof of that is that the Workers' Opposition has definitely left the Russian Communist Party and Third International and thrown in its lot with the Fourth International.

As to the Russian claim for indemnities on account of the damage done in Russia by the intervention of Britain, France, America, Poland, and their subsidising of Wrangel, Denikin, Koltchak, and others, Lloyd George's impudent reply—the reply, it seems, of the allied capitalist Governments—was: "We cannot acknowledge under any circumstances that claim, the brazen reason being that the reactionaries who have fought other revolutions have not paid indemnities. The French Government assisted the British Royalist Party in the time of Cromwell, the British Government assisted the Royalists in the French Revolution; no bill for indemnities was sent in in either case. How simply this one-time professing democrat identifies himself with the historic reactionaries! Lloyd George has thrown in his lot with Toryism in real earnest. Yet it is not so long since George Lansbury, in that guileless contemporary of ours, the *Daily Herald*, was writing: "And why should not David Lloyd George also be a saviour of the people?"

The Genoa Conference has undoubtedly done its part in breaking down Communist tendencies in Russia (may they rise again!) and in serving the interests of British capitalism (though the oil intrigue is, perhaps, not quite so successful as had been hoped by them). There is, however, nothing tangible which can be displayed to the public as a result of the Conference: therefore, Lloyd George has come forward with the story that the Genoa Conference has stopped another great European war by producing a "Peace Pact" to last for a paltry four months after the expiration of The Hague Conference.

Shades of the poor fellows who were pressed into "the war to end war": what a monstrous imposition is this!

When Lloyd George was asked by Asquith where he got his information about the supposed great war he takes credit for having stopped, he answered:

"I got it from the Prime Minister of Poland and the Prime Minister of Roumania."

What were the British Intelligence officers doing that Lloyd George had to get the information in that way? Are there not British officers with the Polish Army? Certainly, if preparations were on foot for war between Poland and Roumania and Russia, the British and French Governments had a hand in it.

Mr. Asquith reminded his rival that on May 17th the Prime Ministers of Poland and Roumania had at Genoa repudiated any suggestion that an attack on Russia was being organised, and that the pact between Russia, Poland, and the Baltic States forbade the war preparations Lloyd George described. Lloyd George's only tangible answer to this was that the final paragraph of the Riga Peace Pact stated:—

"It would be useful that the parties at this meeting should elaborate at Genoa the precise plans, in order to realise the above-mentioned principle."

These words do not appear to indicate that the nations concerned were intending to go to war; but the ways of capitalist diplomacy are tortuous. If, however, the Riga Pact was no guarantee against war, we can feel no security in the Pact of Genoa.

Mr. Asquith and Lord Robert Cecil showed in their attacks on Lloyd George's statement that their policies are virtually the same as his.

Asquith criticised the policy of using force against Soviet Russia, but he approved that policy when it was initiated (nor did the Labour Party then condemn it). Asquith explained that no American representative was at Genoa, but he did not state why the U.S. Government held aloof or what he would have done to secure its co-operation. As everyone knows, America held aloof because her capitalists are sore on the oil question. It is certain that Asquith's policy would be the same as Lloyd George's in that matter. Again, Asquith complained that the participation of France at Genoa was only half-hearted, and he also complained that the question of German reparations had not been dealt with. Asquith would reduce or drop German reparations altogether if he were in power and dared do so, so would Lloyd George, if he dared. The rivals both declared their determination to make Germany pay when the cry was popular in this country. They both agree now that it does not pay Britain to make Germany pay the reparations. They would both like to abandon reparations; but France insists on reparations being kept up. Lloyd George, being in power, is on the horns of a dilemma. Asquith, being irresponsible, attacks Lloyd George, both for not pleasing France and for not abandoning reparations. Lord Robert Cecil adopts the same tactics.

Clynes, who spoke for the Labour Party, was also a jingo advocate of making Germany pay. He now says that France must be told Germany cannot be made to pay so much in the interests of British trade. He was also anxious for trade with Russia, but friendly to Lloyd George. The tenour of his speech indicated that in his view Lloyd George was to be supported with confidence, and that he had done the best that could be done at Genoa.

The Labour Party abstained from voting in the division, in which only 26 votes were cast against the Government.

British capitalists are satisfied that the Prime Minister did his best for them at Genoa. The Labour Party is of the same opinion, and has no substantial criticism to make.

Meanwhile, French capitalism is discontented; it feels itself cheated of its due in the matter of war spoils, and when France is strong enough French capitalists will make France fight Britain. The British Labour leaders, the *Daily Herald*, and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald are preparing the British public to support war with France. They shriek "French militarism" and talk of the black troops France has mobilised, ignoring the fact that British capitalist imperial greed, especially in the matter of oil, is causing other nations to prepare for an attack on Britain in the next capitalist war.

GIVE THIS PAPER TO A FRIEND.

OUR PENAL SYSTEM!

On May 24th there were 450 prisoners in Holloway women's prison. Fifty of these women were first offenders, in the sense that they had never previously been even charged with any breach of the law. This is exceedingly interesting in these days of talk about penal reform, probation officers, and humanitarianism. As a matter of fact, the prisons of to-day are factories of habitual prisoners.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

A CRITICAL APPRECIATION

By ROSA LUXEMBURG.

(Translated from the German by M. CAMPBELL.)

(Continued from last issue.)

A few illustrations will enable us to examine these consequences more thoroughly.

The well-known dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in November 1917 played an all-important part in the policy of the Bolsheviks: it determined their subsequent position and gave a new turn to their tactics, at least in certain matters. It is a fact that prior to their October victories Lenin and his comrades had fervently advocated the convening of the Constituent Assembly. The obstructionist policy of the Kerenski Government in this matter brought the Bolsheviks into the field with bitter accusations against this Government. Indeed, in his interesting little book, "From the October Revolution to the Brest Peace Treaty," Trotsky asserts that the revolutionary events of October did, in truth, "rescue the Constituents, just as they saved the revolution itself." "When we said," he continues, "that the Constituent Assembly could not be ushered in by Tseretelli's preliminary Parliament, but would appear upon the seizure of power by the Soviets, we were speaking quite candidly."

And yet on top of these declarations the first step Lenin took after the October revolution was to disperse the very Constituent Assembly to which the Soviets were supposed to be leading. What could have been the reasons for such a startling development? In the above-mentioned pamphlet Trotsky discusses the matter in detail. We will give his arguments.

"We take it that the months that preceded the October revolution were characterised by a movement towards the Left on the part of the masses. At that time we witnessed a steady flow of workers, soldiers, and peasants into the Bolshevik camp. Very well, then, this process explains how it came about that within the Socialist Revolutionary Party there was a strengthening of the Left Wing at the expense of the Right. But, nevertheless, three-quarters of the names in the Party lists of the Socialist Revolutionaries were old Right Wingers, who therefore still dominated. . . .

"In addition to this we have to take into account that the elections took place in the course of the first weeks after the October subversion. Considering its importance, the news of the change that had taken place travelled slowly. In concentric rings it spread from the capital to the provinces, and from the towns to the villages. There are many places where the peasant masses were anything but well informed as to what was going on in Petrograd and Moscow. They voted for 'Land and Liberty'; that is, they voted for their representative 'Narodniki.' In doing so, however, they voted for Kerenski and Avrentyev, who broke up these Land Committees and had their members arrested. . . . These are actual facts showing clearly to what extent the Constituencies had failed to keep up with the development of the political conflict and were out of touch with the re-grouping of the parties.

That is all most excellent and quite convincing. But it is strange that such clever people as Lenin and Trotsky did not tumble to the conclusion that springs directly out of the above facts. As the Constituent Assembly had been elected a long time before the decisive turning-point (the October revolution), and as its composition reflected a picture of the past and not of the new state of affairs, it was a foregone conclusion that the only course for them to take was to disperse the obsolete, or rather, this still-born Constituent Assembly, and then without delay to go to the electorate for a new Constituent Assembly.* They did not want to, and could not entrust the fate of the revolution to an Assembly that reflected the Russia of yesterday, to the Russia of Kerenski: of the period when everything was in a state of flux, and which was characterised by a coalition with the bourgeoisie. Well, then, as we have just said, the only course open to them was to get this rejuvenated and advanced Russia to elect a new Assembly.

Instead of taking this course, Trotsky lays stress upon the special inadequacy of the Con-

stituent Assembly that came together in October, and comes to the conclusion that the institution was superfluous; indeed, he goes so far as to generalise upon it, insisting upon the worthlessness during the revolution itself of every popular representative institution based upon a general election.

"Thanks to the open and direct struggle for governmental authority, the working masses are accumulating in a very short time a great amount of political experience, and are advancing quickly from one stage of their development to another. The clumsy mechanism of democratic institutions is proportionately less and less able to keep up with this development the greater the country and the more imperfect its technical apparatus." (Trotsky.)

Here we are already faced especially with this "mechanism of democratic institutions." On the contrary, it must be emphasised first of all that a somewhat schismatic, rigid attitude finds its expression in this estimate of representative institutions, and that the historic experience, especially of all revolutionary epochs, emphatically contradicts it. According to Trotsky's theory, each elected Assembly reflects once and for all only the mental make-up, political maturity, and mood of the body of the electors at the very moment it casts its vote. The democratic bodies, according to this conception, remain the reflected image of the masses at the election time, just as the Herschelian firmament shows us the heavenly bodies, not as they are when we look at them, but as they were at the moment they sent out their rays to the earth from such inconceivable distances. All vital correlation of mental outlook between those elected and the body of electors, all lasting action and reaction between both are dismissed as improbable.

How contrary this is to all the experience history affords us! This experience teaches us to expect the opposite: that the life blood of popular emotion is continuously eaving the representative bodies, entering into them and controlling them. How otherwise could we explain the most amusing capers of the "representatives of the people" we witness now and again in every bourgeois Parliament? Suddenly our members of Parliament appeared filled with a "new spirit" and strike quite an unexpected note; the most dried-up mummies hear life's great calls, and all the various little Scheidemann types find their breasts full of revolutionary ardour—if things are beginning to stir in the factories and workshops, and in the streets.

Are we asked to believe that the constant, vital action of the mood and political maturity of the masses upon the elected bodies will fail to take effect upon the voting and upon the rigid plans that are nursed at the headquarters of each party? Are we asked to believe that the Parliament and the political parties will remain unaffected in a revolution, above all times? Impossible! The reverse is the truth. It is just the revolution, with its fierce ardour, that creates that rarefied, vibrating, susceptible political atmosphere in which the waves of popular emotion, the pulse of popular life act, for the time being, in a most wonderful way upon the representative bodies. That is just the very cause and foundation of the famous dramatic scenes that unroll themselves during the first stages of all revolutions, and in which the members of the old reactionary, or very moderate Parliaments, elected under the old regime by a limited franchise suddenly become the heroic spokesmen of the subversion, and are swept by storm and stress. The classic example of this is the celebrated "Long Parliament" in England. Elected and opened in 1642, it remained in office for seven years, during which time its inner life faithfully reflected each shift that resulted from a change in the temper of the people, in their political maturity, and in the class relationships. It thus reflected the progress of the revolution up to its culmination—from the submissive gesture of a kneeling Speaker's first encounter with the throne, up to

the abolition of the House of Lords, the execution of Charles, and the proclamation of the Republic.

Moreover, did not the same wonderful course of events repeat itself in the French States General, in the Censor Parliament of Louis Philippe? Indeed—and Trotsky knew this last, most striking example at first hand—we have it again in the fourth Russian Duma, which, elected in the year of grace 1909, during the most rigid rule of the counter-revolution, suddenly, in February 1917, experienced its second love in a passion for the subversion, and so became the so-called hnmh rfrf dwdwly uhrd mfwy qkq starting-point of the revolution.

All this goes to show that "the clumsy mechanism of democratic institutions" has its powerful corrector in the living movement of the masses and in the uninterrupted pressure these masses exert. The more democratic the institution, the more lively and powerful the political life pulse of the masses, the more direct and true is the effective operation—in spite of rigid party programmes and out-of-date voting systems, etc. Undoubtedly, each democratic institution has its limits and shortcomings: a feature it surely shares in common with all human institutions. The remedy found by Trotsky and Lenin—viz., the complete setting aside of democracy—is, however, worse than the evil it is supposed to check.** It chokes even the living source from which all the innate shortcomings of social institutions spring, and at which alone they can be remedied. This source is the active, unhindered, energetic political life of the great masses of the people.

Let us take another striking illustration: the electoral franchise elaborated by the Soviet Government. It is not quite clear what measure of practical importance can be ascribed to this franchise. From Lenin and Trotsky's criticism of democratic institutions we are led to believe that they are on principle opposed to representative government through general elections, and intend to rely solely on the Soviets. Why there should be, then, any need to elaborate a universal electoral franchise is beyond comprehension. Moreover, as far as we know, there has been no attempt made to call this electoral franchise into being; there is not the slightest trace of any election to any kind of popular representative body with this franchise as a foundation. It is probably nearer the truth to suppose that it is only a product of the theoreticians, and has, so to speak, never got beyond the green table. Nevertheless, taking it as it is, we must consider it a very remarkable product of the Bolshevik theory of the dictatorship. Each franchise (right to vote), like every other political right, is not to be qualified according to some kind of abstract standard of "justice" and similar bourgeois democratic phraseology. It must be viewed within those social and economic conditions and relationships to which it was made to conform. The electoral franchise elaborated by the Soviet Government is specially intended for the transitional period when the bourgeois capitalist form of society is giving way to the Socialist form. It is intended, therefore, for the period of the proletarian dictatorship. In view of the interpretation of this dictatorship upheld by Lenin and Trotsky, the right to vote devolves only upon those who live by their own labour; it is withheld from all others.

Now it is clear that such a franchise can only obtain in a society that is economically in a position to make it possible for all who wish to work to live from their own labour, and yet be comfortably off, and able to attain to a certain standard of culture. Does that apply to the Russia of to-day? Cut off from the world market and from the sources of its most necessary raw materials, Soviet Russia now finds herself confronted with tremendous difficulties. Not only is there an appalling general dislocation of the economic life, but all these conditions under

(Continued on page 8)

* On this point we disagree with Rosa Luxemburg. In our view, the Soviets, not the Constituent Assembly, form the essential administrative machinery of the Revolution.

** The substitution of the Soviets for a Parliament would have meant not a setting aside, but a development of democracy had they functioned adequately.

WORKERS' OPPOSITION.

By Alexandra Kollantay.

(Continued from last week.)

What, then, is it that the Workers' Opposition wants? What is its service?

If its service consists in that it put up before the party all the perturbing questions, that it gave form to all that heretofore was causing only a subdued agitation in the masses and led the non-partisan workers ever further from the party; that it clearly and fearlessly shouted to the leaders: "Stop, look and think! Where do you lead us? Do we not go off the right road? It will be very bad for the party to find itself without the foundation of the dictatorship, the party will remain by itself, and the working class by itself. In this lies the greatest danger to the revolution."

The task of the party at its present crisis is to fearlessly face the mistakes and lend its ear to the healthy class call of the wide working masses. Through the creative powers of the rising class in the form of industrial unions we shall go toward reconstruction and development of creative forces of the country; toward purification of the party itself from the elements foreign to it; toward correction of the activity of the party by means of going back to democracy, freedom of opinion, and criticism inside the party.

THE PART TO BE PLAYED BY THE TRADE UNIONS, AND THEIR PROBLEMS.

In a basic yet brief outline we have already explained what it is that causes the crisis in our party. Now we shall make clear what are the most important points of the controversy between the leaders of our party and the Workers' Opposition. There are two such points: The part to be played, and the problems confronting the trade unions during the reconstruction period of the national economy, coupled with the organisation of production on the Communist basis, and the question of self-activity of the masses coupled with bureaucracy in the party and Soviets.

Let us answer the first question, as the second is the sequence of the first. The period of "making theses" in our party has already ended. Before us we find six different platforms, six party tendencies. Such a variety and such minute variations of shades in its tendencies our party has never seen before, and the party thought has never been so rich in formula on one and the same question. It is, therefore, obvious that the question is a basic one, and very important.

And such it is. The whole controversy simmers down to one basic question: Who shall build the Communist economy, and how shall it be built? This is, moreover, the essence of our programme; this is its heart. This question is not less, if not more, important than the question of seizure of the political state by the proletariat. Only the Bubnoff group of so-called political centralism may be so near-sighted as to underestimate its importance and to say: "The question concerning trade unions at the present moment has no importance whatsoever, and presents none of the theoretical difficulties."

It is, however, quite natural that the question seriously agitates the party as it is in reality the question: In what direction shall we turn the wheel of history—shall we turn it back or move it forward? It is also natural that there is not a single Communist in the party who would remain non-committal during the discussion of this question. As a result we have six different groups.

If we begin, however, carefully to analyse all the theses of these most minutely divergent groups, we find that on the basic question—who shall build the Communist economy and organise production on the new basis—there are only two points of view. One is that which is expressed and formulated in the statement of principles of the Workers' Opposition, and the other is one that unites all the rest of the groups, differing only in shades, but identical in substance.

What does the statement of the Workers' Opposition stand for, and how does the latter understand the part that is to be played by the trade unions, or, to be more exact, by the industrial unions at the present moment? "We believe that the question of reconstruction and

development of the productive forces of our country may be solved only if the entire system of control over the people's economy is changed."

(From Shliapnikoff's report, December 30th.) Take notice, comrades, "only if the entire system of control is changed." What does it mean? "The basis of the controversy"—goes on the report—"revolves around the question: by what means during this period of transformation can our Communist Party carry out its economic policy—whether by means of workers organised into their class unions, or—over their heads—by bureaucratic means, through canonised functionaries of the State." The basis of the controversy is namely this: Whether we shall realise Communism through workers or over their heads, by the hands of Soviet officials. And let us, comrades, ponder whether it is possible to attain and build a Communist economy by the hands and creative abilities of the scions of the other class; who are imbued with their routine of the past? If we begin to think as Marxians, as men of science, we shall answer categorically and explicitly—"No!"

The root of the controversy and the cause of the crisis lies in the supposition that "practical men," technicians, specialists, and managers of capitalist production, can suddenly release themselves from the bonds of their traditional conceptions of ways and means of handling labour, which had been deeply ingrained into their very flesh through the years of their service to capital, and acquire the ability to create new forms of production, of labour organisation, and of incentives to work.

To suppose that is to forget the incontestable truth that a system of production cannot be changed by a few individual geniuses, but by the requirements of a class.

Just imagine for a moment that during the transitory period from the feudal system, founded on slave labour to the system of capitalist production, with its alleged free hired labour in the industries, the bourgeois class, lacking at that time the necessary experience in the organisation of capitalist production, were to invite all the clever, shrewd, experienced managers of the feudal estates who had been accustomed to deal with servile chattel slaves, and entrust to them the task of organising production on a new capitalist basis. What would happen? Would these specialists in their own sphere, depending on the whip to increase productivity of labour, succeed in handling a "free," though hungry, proletarian, who had released himself from the curse of involuntary labour and had become a soldier or a day labourer? Would not these experts wholly destroy the newly-born and developing capitalist production? Individual overseers of the chattel slaves, individual former landlords, and their managers, were able to adapt themselves to the new forms of production, but it was not from their ranks that the real creators and builders of the bourgeois capitalist economy were recruited.

ROSA LUXEMBURG. Continued from page 6.

which production had formerly been carried on have suffered shipwreck as a consequence of the sudden changes in the estimation of and attitude towards property in agriculture, industry, and commerce. It stands to reason, therefore, that untold human lives will have been uprooted, hurled from their proper sphere, and left without any objective possibility of finding some use for their labour power within the economic mechanism. That applies not only to the capitalist and the propertied class, but also to the greater part of the lower middle classes and to the working class itself. It is undoubtedly a fact that the closing down of one industry after another has resulted in masses of urban proletarians streaming out into the country to find some sort of livelihood there. Under such circumstances a political franchise that presupposes a general conscription of labour is a measure that appears totally incomprehensible. The trend of the development indicates that it is only the exploiter who needs to be politically ostracised. Whilst the labour power of the masses is being uprooted, the Soviet Government sees itself, time after time, compelled to hand over on lease, so to speak, the national industry to the former capitalist owners. In the same way the Soviet Government saw itself compelled to come to a

compromise with the bourgeois co-operative societies. Furthermore, it was found that the services of bourgeois experts could not be dispensed with.

Another consequence of the same phenomenon is that ever-increasing numbers of proletarians as Red Guards, etc., are maintained by the State at the public expense. In reality these things have ostracised large and increasing numbers of lower middle class and working class people, for whom the economic organism provides no means whereby they can avail themselves of the labour conscription.

That is an absurd state of affairs, which shows the Utopian character of this electoral franchise and stamps it as being a product of the imagination without any basis in social reality. For that very reason it cannot be a serious instrument of the proletarian dictatorship. It is an anachronism, an anticipation of the conditions when Socialism is established on a proper economic basis; it does not belong to the transition period of the proletarian dictatorship.

In view of the fact that the middle classes, the bourgeois and petty bourgeois intelligentsia boycotted the Soviet Government for months after the October revolution; that they disrupted the railways, post and telegraph services, and crippled the educational and administrative systems in the expression of their revolt against the Workers' Government, it was only natural that they should be made the object of all the repressive measures. These measures (depriving them of political rights and of economic means of subsistence, etc.) were called for; it was the stern course that had to be taken in order to break this resistance. It was just the very thing that gave expression to the Socialist dictatorship which cannot allow itself to be frightened out of its biggest display of might when a certain measure that is going to affect everybody has to be enforced or done away with. On the other hand, this electoral franchise ostracises politically whole strata of society, placing them outside the framework of society, whilst economically it is unable to create a place for them within its borders. The disfranchisement, moreover, is not a concrete measure taken for a concrete purpose, but has to be regarded as a general rule that will be in operation for an unlimited period. This particular application of the right to vote is, therefore, not something necessary for the furtherance of the dictatorship. It is an improvisation that cannot possibly maintain itself in existence. The Soviets come as near to being backbone as the Constituent Assembly to a genuine product of universal suffrage.

(To be continued.)

TOM ANDERSON IN LONDON.

Comrade Tom Anderson, of Glasgow, well known as a pioneer of the Proletarian Schools, is coming to London for a series of meetings lasting from Friday, June 9th, to Sunday, June 18th, inclusive. He will speak during the period as follows:—

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

Saturday, June 10th.—3 p.m., Catherine Road, East Ham. Subject: "Down and Out"; 8 p.m., Peckton Road, Canning Town. Subject: "Athenion, the Slave King."

Sunday, June 11th.—3 p.m., Peckham Rye. Subject: "An Episode of the Paris Commune." 3 p.m., Parliament Hill. Subject: "The Two Slaves."

Monday, June 12th.—Noon, Tower Hill. Subject: "John Davidson." 8 p.m., Water Lane, Stratford. Subject: "The Idea of a King."

Tuesday, June 13th.—Noon, Albert Dock, Connaught Road. Subject: "The Fat Bourgeois." 8 p.m., Tottenham Corner. Subject: "The Story of a Communist."

Wednesday, June 14th.—Noon, Leather Lane. Subject: "Rebel Songs." 8 p.m., Wren Road, Camberwell. Subject: "Proletcult."

Thursday, June 15th.—Noon, Arsenal, Woolwich. Subject: "Across the Ages." 8 p.m., Minerva Cafe, At Home.

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

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

Sunday, June 18th.—11 a.m., Victoria Park; 5 p.m., Trafalgar Square.

UNEMPLOYED.

I met him in Trafalgar Square, fellow-worker. He was an old soldier, discharged medically unfit. He was not fit when they conscribed him. As a matter of fact, he ought to have been doing a seaside rest cure years before the war broke out; but civilisation in the hub of this Empire on which the sun never sets cannot afford such amenities for the ordinary poor labourer unless he is an "exceptional case" or some exceptional person takes an interest in him.

The Army soon broke down the remnants of his health. He was discharged without pension. Someone took his case up and he got a few shillings a week for a few months, but the pittance was soon stopped.

Now he is "down and out" he gets no pension, no insurance dole, no relief from the Guardians.

How does he live? He hardly knows, fellow-worker; he exists somehow. His eyes are half shut; he has boils on his face and neck; he is as pitiable an object as anyone you could see. He is "down and out," fellow-worker, and there are many more like him. I saw him at the unemployed meeting in Trafalgar Square, in a crowd of men and women in all stages of breakdown.

Mr. Clynes was not there, nor Mr. Henderson, nor any of the leaders of organised labour. In Parliament and out; such distinguished people have little to say about the unemployed. Your misfortunes have become chronic, fellow-workers who are workless; other people have got used to them; have you?

The Poplar Guardians are getting into trouble again for being too lavish in relieving the unemployed. But if you go down to Poplar, fellow-worker, you will not see the people there looking like the men and women of Mayfair. You will see broken boots, shabby clothes, undernourished bodies, drawn and worried faces in undue numbers in Poplar, in spite of the so-called "frenzied Labour finance."

The fact is, fellow-worker, the fuss that is being made about Poplar's expenditure is simply a warning to the other Boards of Guardians to harden their hearts towards the unemployed. The Guardians of most districts are taking the hint: they do not want to be surcharged, nor do they want to go to gaol or be made notorious.

Therefore, they line up solidly on behalf of "sound capitalist finance," and in a large and growing number of cases refuse any relief save the Workhouse and the Poor-Law schools to the women and children, and the Labour Colony to the men.

The unemployed who do not wish to accept imprisonment in the Workhouse, slavery on the Labour Colony, and the breaking-up of the family, choose the alternative of starvation.

How long is it to go on, fellow-workers?

Mr. Lloyd George is not disturbed in his mind by your extraordinary apathy; nor is Mr. Asquith, nor Lord Northcliffe, Lord Rothschild, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the King, or any of the other members of the ruling classes. On the contrary, they are pleased by your fortitude in suffering: they hope that your fortitude in suffering may increase, and yours also, fellow-workers, whose wages have been reduced beneath subsistence level. May you all continue cheerfully to sacrifice yourselves for the sake of the rich and powerful: the few who play the part of the horse-leech in our land! Be assured, fellow-worker, the comfortable upholders of capitalism are not going to stir you up to any revolt. They greatly prefer that you should content yourselves with a chance of winning a shilling or two through the bookie.

But you, fellow-workers, when will you wake up to the fact that the power to change all this is in your own hands?

The workers, with the aid of modern machinery, have the power to produce more of everything the community needs than the community can consume. They have only to set to work to supply without charge all that the community needs, to end all this misery and want.

How shall they do it? They should begin by organising on workshop lines in *One Big Revolutionary Union*, and take control of the industries and transport.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT BOOK SERVICE.

152, FLEET STREET

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

We can supply you with any book, magazine, or newspaper you desire, new or second-hand, from British Colonial, or, foreign publishers. Give us all particulars you have, and send a deposit.

By buying books from us, trade discount is transferred to propaganda; for this reason, send your order direct to us, and not through other societies.

At our office you may consult publishers catalogues and place your order for any book not in stock.

If you order by post, you must add, at the average, one penny for every shilling, to cover postage.

We charge the postage of foreign books, from London only, and fix price at current rate of exchange. Purchasers will save themselves trouble by opening an account of 10/- or 20/- with us, in order to avoid the repeated sending of small postal orders, which means paying useless poundage to the Government.

WE CAN SUPPLY!

Books on History, Economics, etc.

Cloth Covers.

Woman and Labour (Olive Schreiner).....	4/6
Social Theory (G. D. H. Cole).....	4/6
Capital To-day (Cahn).....	10/-
Government and People (Conrad Gill).....	7/6
A.B.C. of Communism (Bukharin).....	3/6
The Inequality of Incomes in Modern Communities (Hugh Dalton, M.A.).....	10/6
Origin of Poverty, and Formation of the Village Community (J. St. Lewinski, D.Ec.Sc., Brussels).....	8/6
Creative Revolution (C. & E. Paul).....	8/6
Justice and Liberty (G. Lones Dickinson).....	3/-

The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain in the 19th Century (L. C. A. Knowles, Litt.D.).....	432 pp. 6/6
The Next War (Will Irwin).....	7/6
Radiant Motherhood (Marie Stopes).....	6/-
Married Love (Marie Stopes).....	6/-
Wise Parenthood (Marie Stopes).....	3/6
Poverty of Philosophy (Marx).....	7/-
Science and Revolution (Untermann).....	3/6
The World's Revolutions (Untermann).....	3/6
Marxian Economics (Untermann).....	6/6
Anarchism and Socialism (Pechanof).....	3/6
The Collapse of Capitalism (Cahn).....	3/6
Capitalism To-day (Cahn).....	10/-
The Right to be Lazy (Lafargue).....	3/6
Social Studies (Lafargue).....	3/6
The Evolution of Property (Lafargue).....	3/6
Memoirs of Marx (Wilhelm Liebknecht).....	3/6
Origin of the Family (Engels).....	3/6
Essays on Materialist Conception of History (Labriola).....	6/6
Wages, Prices and Profits.....	4/6
Men and Steel (Mary Heaton Vorse).....	3/6
Capital (Karl Marx).....	7/6
Civil War in France (Karl Marx).....	1/6
Socialism and Modern Science (Ferri).....	6/6
Economic Causes of War (Achille Loria).....	6/6
Alphabet of Economics (A. R. Orage).....	2/6
Fields, Factories and Workshops (Kropotkin).....	2/-
Conquest of Bread (Kropotkin).....	2/-
Hugo Stinnes (H. Brinckmayer).....	7/6
International Labour Legislation (H. J. W. Hetherington, M.A.).....	4/6
Paper Covers.	
The Irish Labour Movement (W. P. Ryan).....	2/6
Left Wing Trade Unionism in France (Pierre Monatte and others).....	1/6
Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power? (Francis Delaisi).....	2/6
The Eighteenth Brumaire (Karl Marx).....	1/6
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific (Engels).....	1/6
Study Course in Scientific Socialism.....	1/6
No Compromise (Liebknecht).....	8d.
Marxism and Darwinism (Pannekoek).....	8d.
The Rights of the Masses (George D. Brewer).....	8d.
The Right to be Lazy (Paul Lafargue).....	8d.
Anarchism and the World Revolution (Fred S. Graham).....	1/-
The Way Out (Wilfrid Wellock).....	1/-
Reform or Revolution (Daniel de Leon).....	2d.

Buy all your books through the "Dreadnought" office.

Who Pays the Taxes (Daniel de Leon).....	2d.
Socialism and Evolution (H. S. Aley, M.D.).....	1d.
Marx on Mallock: Or Facts v. Fiction (Daniel de Leon).....	2d.

Novels, Poetry, etc., with a Communist Tendency

Cloth Covers.	
Looking Backward (Edward Bellamy).....	3/6
Looking Beyond. A Sequel to "Looking Backward" (L. A. Goussier).....	3/6
Dreams (Olive Schreiner).....	3/6
The Red Lily (Anatole France).....	2/-
Penguin Island (Anatole France).....	2/-
Thais (Anatole France).....	2/-

POPLAR TOWN HALL NEWBY PLACE
A GRAND DANCE

will be held in the above hall on

FRIDAY, JUNE 9th, 1922,

commencing at 8 p.m.

Doors open at 7.30 p.m.

SAM YOUNG'S ORCHESTRA IN ATTENDANCE.

M.C.: MR. C. W. ANDERSON.

Admission, 1s. 6d.

Tickets can be obtained from—

Miss N. Smyth, 152 Fleet Street, E.C. 4.
Mr. John Cox, 5 Brunswick Street, Poplar.
Mr. Sam Young, 69 Salmon Lane, Limehouse.
Mr. Mack, 149 East Road, Charlton.
Mr. Crabb, 23 Selwyn Road, Bow.
Mr. Golub, Osborn Street, Whitechapel.

MEETING.

SUNDAY, JUNE 18th, 5 p.m.,

TRAFALGAR SQUARE.

UNEMPLOYMENT: ITS CAUSE AND CURE.

Speakers:

TOM ANDERSON, CLARA COLE, T. HODSON,
SYLVIA PANKHURST, and others.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY.

WORKS FOR COMMUNISM.—A classless order of society in which there shall be no rich and poor, no masters or servants, no landlords and capitalists, no buying and selling, no money, no wages. Each shall use according to need and desires of the earth's fruits and the product of the common labour. Each shall give to the service of the community according to capacity. Production and distribution shall be organised by those who do the work through the Soviets.

TACTICS.—No compromise with non-Communists and Reformers. No affiliation with the Labour Party. Continuous teaching of Communism. Continuous struggle for Communism.

Preparation for the Soviets: that is to say, organisation of the workers to take over and administer the industries of the creation of One Big Revolutionary Union with industrial departments built up from the workshop basis on the Soviet model. Continuous teaching of the futility of Parliamentary action, refusal to take part in it, preparation for the Soviets.

Write to the Preliminary Committee for the Communist Workers' Party (Fourth International), Workers' Dreadnought Office, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

MEETING,

Minerva Café,

Sunday, June 4th, 4 p.m.

Sylvia Pankhurst will open the discussion on "COMMUNISM."

Tea. Literature. Collection.

AT HOME,

Minerva Café,

Thursday, June 8th, 7.30 p.m.,

TO MEET TOM ANDERSON.

All are welcome.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

—Would like to buy some books on Free Thought.
FRANK J. DENT, 156 Whitecross Street, E.C. 1.

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

Published by E. Selvia 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.