

Why they fight in Ireland.

Workers'



Dreadnought

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by
SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. IX. No. 25.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1922.

[WEEKLY. PRICE TWOPENCE.]

Capitalism v. Communism.

The Problem of Population.

The *Manchester Guardian*, as everyone knows, has been bringing out, during recent months, some formidable-looking supplements on *Reconstruction in Europe*. In these volumes the views of European Liberal capitalists, and some others, have been set forth under the editorship of Mr. John Maynard Keynes, in the interests of maintaining the hoary old fabric of capitalism, under which we and the world are suffering. The first part of section six of this amusing series is devoted to the population problem.

The Gloomy Malthusian.

Mr. Keynes opens the deliberations in gloomy fashion. He is confessedly a follower of Malthus, and fears the growth of population; fears it especially for this country. He declares that we are suffering from a growth of population which has arisen through "events, some of which took place in 1855, at the time of the Crimean War, and none of which took place later than 1905." He fears we can get no relief: "However great the disequilibrium that results, compensating forces cannot produce their full effect for twenty years and more, unless they are actually destructive of life. Such violent compensation is, in fact, highly improbable; and what is much more likely to occur is a slow but steady lowering in the standard of living." Apparently another war is necessary to put matters right from the Keynes standpoint, since even the losses of the Great War have left us with what he regards as a dangerously large population.

He adds: "The number of males between twenty and sixty is, in spite of war casualties, 300,000 more than it was in 1911, a number considerably in excess of the total unemployed. It is not sufficient, therefore, that our trade should recover to its pre-war volume of activity—which is generally the utmost for which we can now hope—it must be on a substantially larger scale, approximately larger than in 1911, if we are not to lose ground. Moreover, for many years to come, regardless of what the birth-rate may be from now onwards, upwards of 250,000 new labourers will enter the labour market annually in excess of those going out of it. To maintain this growing body of labour at the same standard of life as before, we require not only growing markets, but a growing capital equipment. In order to hold our heads above water, the national capital must grow as fast as the national labour supply, which means new savings at the rate of £400,000,000 to £500,000,000 per annum. . . .

"The same problem is present in an even acuter form in some other parts of Europe. Possibly unseen developments may intervene to help us. But, failing the unforeseen, the problem is, I think, of much greater magnitude than can be solved by Dr. Brownlee's expedient of emigration, which is only an expensive palliative."

Mr. Keynes, the leader and hope of the Liberal Reconstructionists, appears to have no solution to offer unless it be, as he vaguely hints, that of birth control, which is largely advocated by his co-writers.

If, as Mr. Keynes says, capitalism can only support our population if the capitalists are able to milk four or five hundred million pounds of "savings" out of the producing classes each year, it ought not to be difficult for the ordinary man and woman in the street to realise that capitalism is played out.

Vienna's Numerous Parasites.

The facts of the case are very naively stated by Herr Alfred Francis Pribram, Professor of Modern History at Vienna University. He says that the population of Vienna in 1920 was 1,800,000, and that instead of being the metropolis for an empire of fifty million people, as before the War, Austria now having only a population of 6,350,000, Vienna now includes 30 per cent. of the Austrian population. Of the Viennese population in 1920, only a little more than half had any occupation outside their homes; that is to say, 616,436 out of 851,000 men, and 362,468 out of 990,000 women worked outside their homes. 363,974 persons were engaged in their own housekeeping, 504,448 had no occupation. Of those who had occupations, only 25 per cent. were directly engaged in production. Ten per cent., including railwaymen and postal officials, were in the service of the State.

Professor Pribram declares that to put matters right, "those engaged in production must raise their output," and "the number of officials and others engaged in unproductive occupations must be reduced."

The professor has seen a glimmering of the truth, only a glimmering. He laments the fact that:

"So far all attempts to dissuade the workmen from a rigid adherence to the eight-hour day have failed."

It does not occur to him that, instead of adding to the burden of those who are already producers, their number should be increased by recruits from amongst the persons whose work is unnecessary, or who do no work at all.

What to do with the Useless People.

The professor sorrowfully adds that "the efforts of the Government to diminish the number of State employees have been almost equally unavailing. To thrust the superfluous officials into the street "would not accord with the social settlement of to-day," he says. He makes instead a very remarkable proposition. We give it in his own naive words:

"The idea suggests itself of finding, in foreign countries, for the superfluous officials, as well as for those officers who have not succeeded in making a living at home, an occupation in keeping with their capabilities, inclinations, and experience. But a corresponding return must be offered to those States that might be disposed to receive such emigrants. Now Austria possesses a comparatively large number of excellent craftsmen, distinguished for the taste and quality of their work, whose performances are of a high order in leather and fancy goods, in cabinet-making, in locksmith work, in printing and the graphic arts, in toy-making, and in the manufacture of instruments. It would certainly be a heavy sacrifice for the individuals, as well as for the community, if some of this valuable productive labour were to emigrate; moreover, it might be urged, not without justification, that these artisans, and especially the younger of them, have constant need of the stimulus which their homes provide for them, but which would be lacking abroad. Let all this be granted; but necessity knows no law, and it would be more in keeping with the dignity of the Austrian State and its citizens not to approach the Council table once again with

empty hands. How would it be, then, if a corresponding number of artisans were placed at the disposal of those States who pledged themselves to offer a home and a career to Austrian officials and officers? Austria would thus bring a not insignificant asset into the transaction. Our artisans could at once commence a successful activity in the land of their adoption, and thus recompense her for the trouble and expense which would be involved in the acceptance of the officials and officers. But to what occupation could these latter be put? It would certainly not be difficult for the ex-officers to make their own living on their own account. Thrown out of their former career by the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian forces, they have shown their power of adaptation to the new conditions of life. Accustomed to their rigid performance of duty, discipline, and frugality, they have drawn their conclusions from the facts given and have applied themselves, each according to his inclination and capacity, to the most diverse callings. Thus many an ex-officer is doing excellent work to-day as manufacturer, as merchant, as man of business, and in the independent occupations. Without doubt, those who have succeeded in earning a permanent living at home will readily set out on their travels if the prospect is offered them of attaining this object in far-off countries by their own exertions in any calling whatever. It will be more difficult to accommodate the emigrating of officials who in general lack the power of adaptation. Most of them will probably have to turn their attention to agricultural pursuits, for which, in the case of many—e.g., of the railway employees—their custom of working in allotment and garden should be of utility.

"The advantage which would accrue to the city of Vienna through the emigration of these people, who are superfluous at home—their number may be put at some 100,000—is obvious. Huge sums could be saved, and, in addition, the remaining officials could be better paid. . . .

"Finally, one more question which arises spontaneously to the lips of anyone who knows the Viennese character—Will those summoned to voluntary expatriation answer the call? We reply openly and frankly: It will not be accomplished without compulsion. The authorities will have to summon up the energy to place the choice before the younger officials . . . of either starting a new life across the sea with Government assistance, or remaining at home at their own risk and responsibility. . . . With our artisans the Government will, of course, not be able to use any compulsion. They must be brought to a decision by the hope of more ample earnings, by the proud consciousness of winning recognition abroad for Austrian industrial arts, and by the inspiring feeling of having assisted their fellow-countrymen to an assured livelihood."

The Professor is frank indeed! He proposes, without shame, that, in order to induce foreign countries to accept some of Austria's parasites, a number of her useful productive workers shall

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

be shipped away to pay for the incubus, although to part with these productive workers will entail heavy sacrifice, not only for the workers concerned, but for the Austrian community itself.

As for the polite fiction that the bargain to provide posts for the parasites should not extend to the lowly railwaymen who are accustomed to work on their allotments, but should be confined to the officers because of their superior "power of adaptation": that is a transparent falsehood. It is proposed that the railwaymen should find work in agriculture because they are wage workers, and it is intended that they should remain subordinate. The officers, on the other hand, belong to the privileged classes. The Professor is anxious that they should not be deposed from their little pedestals.

The opinion of Mr. Keynes is given as "An Economist's View of Population." "A Philosopher's View" is provided by an Italian, Signor Benedetto Croce, who is an adept in the art of saying very little in a very wordy fashion. He gives a mild approval to Malthusianism. "An Historian's View of Population" is given by another Italian, Signor Ferrero. This gentleman is opposed to large populations for a curious reason. He says:

"It will have to be recognised that too rapid a multiplication of population has its dangers, though different ones from those imagined by Malthus. The real danger is not, as he feared, it will impoverish the great mass; but that it will unduly enrich it—beyond the measure of its good sense."

Signor Ferrero fears the possible advent of political anarchy and deprecates the spread of education:

"All wish to be students, even those who are incapable of learning; intellectual culture becomes general, and as it spreads it deteriorates."

Signor Ferrero yearns, as he explains, for the society which existed before the French Revolution—a society in which culture, leisure, and ease were the prerogatives of the few, whilst the many were merely the driven herd ministering to the privileged and at the disposal of the privileged. To that bygone social state we shall never return; but the bankruptcy of Liberalism is clearly shown by the fact that the principal organ of British Liberalism publishes in its reconstruction series an article which sighs for the old order of privilege and the restriction of culture and opportunity, and which dreads the "prospect of abundance for all."

Japan's Overflowing Population.

Baron Keikichi Ishimoto, of Tokyo, urgently demands birth control for Japan, and declares:

"Bertrand Russell and H. G. Wells have warned the Japanese nation that Japan must adopt birth control."

These two gentle British Imperialists of erratic views evidently see in the restriction of Japan's growing population a happy means of avoiding "the Yellow Peril," which, of course, is really the competition of the yellow races with the European.

Baron Keikichi Ishimoto says that the population of Japan increases by 600,000 to 700,000 a year, and Japan is one of the most densely populated nations on earth. Emigration from Japan is relatively small, the average increase in the Japanese population abroad being only from 10,000 to 20,000 a year, which includes the children born to Japanese emigrants. The small rate of emigration the Baron attributes to the hostility of Japan and Australia, countries to which Japanese emigrants would naturally go, and the fact that the Japanese workers cannot make a living in Korea, Manchuria, and Siberia because they cannot compete with Korean and Chinese labourers, who work for 30 to 40 sen a day. In the last ten years only 30,000 Japanese farm workers went to Korea, in spite of the efforts of the Oriental Development Company to induce them. The Prime Minister of Japan advocates that the Japanese should emigrate to Central and South America, but the journey costs 200 yen—£20—and as much more is required before the emigrant can find a job. To send 600,000 people there would, therefore, cost £24,000,000 a year. "Such a huge expenditure will be impossible

unless the Budgets for the Navy and Army are permanently halved," says the Baron. Communism could readily cope with this problem. Communism will require no armies and navies, but under capitalist imperialism Japan can only safeguard her independence and find means of expansion by maintaining a large army and navy.

The Baron further points out that 2,400,000 tons of shipping would be required to transport 600,000 people to South America, since six return trips only could be made in a year. The total Japanese tonnage in 1920 was only 2,920,000. Thus emigration to South America, if carried out on the scale required to meet the superfluous population would use up almost all the Japanese shipping.

Under Communism Japan's expanding population would, of course, overflow into the more sparsely populated countries of the neighbouring mainland, where the work of the industrious Japanese would be welcome and would help to increase the general prosperity. With the abolition of private property and the wages system, the Japanese immigrants would take their fill of the common stock which they would help to produce; the absurd barrier of low wages which at present debars the Japanese from the lands which are nearest, and where their activities would be most useful, would be no more.

Baron Keikichi discusses also the possibility of importing from abroad food, principally rice, for the support of Japan's overflowing population. He says that in 1931, at the present rate of increase in population and rice production, Japan will have a population of 62,000,000, requiring 86,000,000 koku of rice per year, and Japan will be producing 66,000,000 koku per year. There will thus be a shortage of 20,000,000 koku of rice. He does not think it possible to secure such a large import, and says it would be necessary for the Japanese to eat rice mixed with inferior cereals "which the Japanese people cannot stand." We warrant that the consumption per head of rice is lower amongst the richer class of Japanese than amongst the workers, because the richer people have a much more varied diet, but they do not mix their rice with inferior cereals. We warrant that under Communism, not only could the rice be procured, but the present varied diet of the rich could also be obtained for the working class. We do not think the Baron would deny that if the efforts Japan now spends upon the Army and Navy and the maintenance of the present social order were devoted to procuring food for the people, either at home or from abroad, the necessary supplies could undoubtedly be obtained.

Having disposed, as he considers, of the alternatives of emigration and the import of food, Baron Keikichi Ishimoto falls back on what he believes to be the only alternative—birth control—saying:

"Japan must regulate her population, whether it is moral or immoral to do so."

How it is to be done the Baron does not say. It may be that he intends a compulsory sterilisation of Japanese women; it may be that he is merely proposing an appeal to the masses not to multiply.

Mr. Keynes, more deeply dyed in capitalist method, regards the problem more remotely than the Japanese Baron. The Japanese asks how enough food is to be found for the people. Mr. Keynes, on the other hand, asks, first, how enough wage work is to be found which will be profitable to the man with money to invest, and only indirectly, as a consequence of that problem does he refer to the standard of living? Since Mr. Keynes is thinking of the problem of what is to be done with labourers whom capitalism does not find it profitable to employ, he is troubled by the fact that those labourers were born upwards of fifteen years ago. The Baron, who is thinking more directly of the mouths to be fed, mouths that require rice as soon as they are weaned from the mother's breast, makes a more immediate appeal for the limitation of the coming population. Yet the thought of both these men seems to be travelling in the same direction. Keynes says:

"The problem of population is going to be in the near future the greatest of all political

problems. . . . When the instability of society forces the issue, a great transition in human history will have begun, with the endeavour by civilised man to assume conscious control in his own hands."

How can the problem be solved within the framework of capitalism? This is the question those who uphold capitalism are asking. The answer to this question is: It cannot.

Compulsory Work in Bulgaria.

In Bulgaria, where the Socialist and small peasant parties were exceptionally strong even before the War, the Government in power has been made at least to admit the fact that only through work applied to natural resources can the problem of adequately sustaining the people be solved. A mere formal recognition of this fact, but not a substantial measure of dealing with it, is seen in the Bulgarian compulsory labour law, described in an article by the Prime Minister, M. Stambolisky. This law compels all boys, on attaining twenty years, to give eight months' work for the community, and all girls at sixteen to give four months' work. All men between twenty and fifty, and all women between sixteen and thirty, render ten days' compulsory service a year. The men work on roads, railways, canals, waterworks, dams and embankments, in the draining of marshes, the laying of telephone cables, in afforestation, mining, in the building of schools, in the State studs, cultivation of State lands, and so on. The women work in the communes where they live, and receive instruction in household and other work.

This is an artificial and inefficient method of dealing with the community's need of service. It is only a tinkering with the problem; but the great countries do not even tinker with it. They allow the great volume of non-productive work, in buying, selling, advertising, banking, and bookkeeping which the capitalist system entails, to become an ever-increasing burden, whilst productive work occupies an ever-smaller proportion of the people.

Germany's Fear of Reduced Population.

The contributor of the paper on the German population, Dr. M. Hahn, shows that the German population has been reduced by 12,000,000 since the War. Of this loss, 6,741,052 is in population which has been transferred to the dominion of other countries; it does not, therefore, represent an actual diminution of population. The remaining part of the loss is made up thus:

Killed in the War	1,711,154
Loss through reduction of the birth-rate, 1914-19	3,300,000
Increased mortality amongst the civilian population	500,000

Dr. Hahn is at the opposite pole to Mr. Keynes; he desires not a smaller, but a larger number of workers, and welcomes the "gain in labour resources" through the expulsion of Germans from enemy countries and colonies. He deprecates the loss in population of children between one and five years which occurred during the War, and that the present hard times will undoubtedly bring about a reduction in the birth-rate, through the simple fact parents cannot find food for many children.

Dr. Hahn further states that doctors report an increase in the number of sterile marriages. This he attributes largely to the increase of venereal diseases in all countries since the War. Capitalist Imperialism has, indeed, much to answer for, but its upholders shut their eyes to such facts.

Tuberculosis to Become an Epidemic Plague.

An increase of tuberculous diseases, particularly amongst women and children, and chiefly affecting the skin and lymphatic glands, grew up during the War. It continues in Germany, on account of "the continuing insufficiency of nourishment, the retrogression in personal and public hygiene owing to the general poverty, and the increased risk of infection arising from the housing shortage."

Dr. Hahn foreshadows "tuberculosis raised to an epidemic plague," and says that through it "our greatest danger lies ahead."

(Continued on page 8)

ESPERANTO.

SLOSILO DE L'EKZERCO 11.

What shall we do during our meetings?—Of course we shall have to learn to speak, read, and write the international language.—Have we gifted persons who will be able to sing and recite?—I am sure we have; we have musicians also.—I am glad of that, for I wish to arrange concerts and plays in Esperanto.

EKZERCO No. 12.

Ciusemajne la lernantoj legas facilajn frazojn en nia gazeto, kaj malpli facilajn legojn el "La Komunista Manifesto," kiu estas tradukita de amerikano. Tiuj, kiuj volas multon legi, ŝatas "Sennacieca Revuo," organon de Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda, kiu estas kaj informa kaj literatura. Bonegajn lingvajn ekzercojn oni trovas en la "Ekzercoaro" de Zamenhof.

VORTARETO.

ano	member	nacieco	nationality
aro	collection	oni	one
bonega	excellent	pli	more
facila	easy	sen	without
kiu	who	tiuj	those
mondo	world	traduki	to translate
multo	much	trovi	to find

Legajo—reading matter. Compare *teatraĵo*.

Tradukita—translated. *Ita* is the sign of the past participle (passive).

Kaj . . . kaj means "both . . . and."

Oni is the English indefinite pronoun "one."

MANIFESTO DE LA KOMUNISTA PARTIO.

† Tio estas, la tuta skribita historio. En 1847, la antaŭa historio de la socio, la socia organizo ekzistinta antaŭ la rekordita historio, estis preskaŭ nekonata. Post tiam, Hakssthausen eltrovis komunan posedecon de la tero en Ruslando. Maurer pruvis ke ĝi estis la socia fondaĵo el kiu ĉiuj teŭtonaj rasoj ekkomencis en historio kaj, iom poste, oni trovis ke vilaĝaj komunumoj estas, aŭ estis, la primitiva formo de la socio ĉie, de Hindujo ĝis Irlando. La interna organizo de tiu primitiva komunista socio estis nudigata, en sia tipa formo, per la fina eltrovo de Morgan, pri la reala naturo de la familiego (angle, gens) kaj ĝia rilato al la gento. Je la dissolvo de tiuj praj komunumoj, la socio komencas esti diferencigata en apartajn kaj fine antagonismajn klasojn. Mi provis ree sekvi tiun ĉi dissolvadon en: "Der Ursprung der Familie des Privateigentums und des Staats," dua eldono, Stuttgart, 1886.

‡ Gildmajstro, tiu estas plena membro de gildo, majstro en, ne estro de, gildo.

En la pli fruaj epokoj de la historio, ni trovas preskaŭ ĉie komplikigitan aranĝon de la socio en diversajn klasojn, multoblan gradigadon de socia viceco. En antikva Romo sin trovis patricioj, kavileroj, plebejoj, sklavoj; en la mezepokoj, feŭdismaj sinjoroj, vasaloj, gildmajstroj, metilistoj, metilernantoj, servutuloj; en preskaŭ ĉiuj el tiuj klasoj, ree, estis filiaj gradigoj.

La moderna kapitalista socio kiu estas ekkreskinta el la ruinoj de la feŭda socio, ne estas foriginta klasajn antagonismojn. Ĝi nur starigis novajn klasojn, novajn statojn de subpremo, novajn formojn de batalado anstataŭ la malnovaj.

Nia epoko, la epoko de la kapitalistaro, posedas, tamen, tiun ĉi distingnan econ—ĝi estas simpliginta la klasajn antagonismojn. La socio kiel tuto estas pli kaj pli sin dividanta en du grandajn malpacajn kampojn, en du grandajn klasojn rekte fronto fronton: kapitalistaro kaj proletariaro.

De la servutuloj de la mezepokoj ekkreskis a enrajtigataj burĝoj de la unuaj urboj (*towns*). El tiuj ĉi burĝaroj la unuaj elementoj de la kapitalistaro kreskadis.

SENNACIECA—ASOCIO—TUTMONDA.

La dua kongreso de la revoluciuloj esperantistoj, aŭgusto 12-16, 1922, en Frankfurt/Main, entenant 220 d-legitojn laboristajn el 12 nacioj, sendas siajn tutfratajn salutojn.

Por la kongres-komitato.

T. ROTH.

Leteradreso:

Rodelheimerlandstrasse 131.

SENNACIECA—ASOCIO—TUTMONDA.

The second congress of revolutionary Esperantists, August 12th to 16th, 1922, in Frank-

furt A. Main, at which were present 220 delegates from workers' organisations from twelve nationalities, send their fraternal greetings.

For Congress Committee,
T. ROTH.

Letters addressed:

Rodelheimerlandstrasse 131.

UNDER THE STARS AND STRIPES.
U.S. Marine Transport Workers Refuse to Handle Coal From Britain to Break Miners' Strike.

The Manhattan, New York City, Branch of the Marine Transport Union, which is an integral part of the I.W.W., announces its refusal to handle British coal during the U.S. miners' strike.

American industrial interests had planned, it is declared, to bring 1,000,000 tons of coal from foreign ports, to be delivered in September, in Shipping Board vessels and private ships. But ships cannot move without labour, the M.T.W. points out, and its members, who have multiplied greatly in recent months, following the breakdown of the old International Seamen's Union, will not act in any strike-breaking capacity.

Active upbuilding of the M.T.W. organisation has been going on for more than a year in all ports of the United States.

Beating Members of the I.W.W.

From Aberdeen, South Dakota, comes news of attempts to terrorise men on account of I.W.W. membership. Thomas Umlah, organiser of the Agricultural Workers' Industrial Union, which is an I.W.W. unit, was talking with two migratory harvest workers on August 3rd. Two police officials (deputy sheriffs) appeared, and, hustling Umlah into a corner, beat him and took all his possessions, including a five-dollar note. On the same day John Bodner, I.W.W., was recruiting members, when a similar attack was made upon him. Harry Arthurs, I.W.W., was arrested, and after two days was brought out of gaol at night and released in the hands of two plain-clothes policemen, who took him in a motor car to a lonely spot several miles from the town. There they knocked him down, jumped on him, and beat him across the back till he was crippled. The same night Mike Webster, I.W.W., who had also been arrested, was brought out in a car and maltreated in the same manner. Arthurs is bringing an action against the Aberdeen authorities for assault. C. A. Kelly, Mayor of Huron, South Dakota, is acting as his lawyer. Webster and Arthurs are both in the doctor's hands, and will bear the scars of the beating all their lives. It is believed that Arthur will be permanently crippled.

"Cleaning Up" the Jungle.

"The Jungle" is a camping place for migratory workers, about twenty miles from Aberdeen, South Dakota. Deputy-Sheriff G. H. Glau made it his business to "clean up" "The Jungle" twice a week. His method is thus described by an eye-witness:

"He carries a loaded cane, and is an artist at using it. I have seen him go through a bunch of forty men in the jungle while his partner stood guard with two revolvers. Glau swung the cane at the heads of his victims with gleeful brutality."

During the War the reactionaries in Brown County, of which Aberdeen is the seat, dealt with the I.W.W. through an organisation of "best citizens," known as the Knights of Liberty, who waited around gaol doors at night for the authorities to release unionists; then the brave knights would take the released prisoners out on the roads and ill-treat them.

Class-War Prisoners.

In addition to those in State prisons, there are in U.S. federal prisons still seventy-two I.W.W. members and two Oklahoma men to be released through commutation September 1st, as well as five other federal politicals. These are: seventy-two I.W.W. members and two Oklahoma men to be released through commutation September 1st, only five other federal politicals now remain in prison. These are:

Nicholas M. Zogg, of Los Angeles, Mexican citizen, serving ten years at Atlanta for interfering with the drafting of Mexicans into the United States Army. Tubercular.

Daniel O'Connell, lawyer, of San Francisco, serving seven years in McNeil's Island, Washington, for speeches and literature directed toward testing "the constitutionality of the Conscription Act."

J. O. Bentall, Socialist, of Duluth, Minn., serving five years in Leavenworth for anti-war speech.

Ricardo Flores Magon, Mexican citizen, serving twenty years in Leavenworth; convicted for a mad festa in his paper *Regeneracion*, advocating a working-class revolution against a cruel regime in Mexico now passed into history. His pardon application has been rejected because he is "not yet repentant." Magon is going blind.

Librado Rivera, Mexican citizen, serving fifteen years in Leavenworth. Convicted as assistant editor with Magon, for the same offence.

Counsel for Magon and Rivera has informed the Federal authorities that the Mexican Government is willing to receive both men across the border if the United States will set them free. But apparently the United States is waiting for them to repent, saying harsh things about the savage despotism of Porfirio Diaz.

Prisoners' Hunger Strike.

SAN FRANCISCO.—Fourteen members of the Industrial Workers of the World, serving sentences in San Quentin Penitentiary, San Francisco, for alleged criminal syndicalism, have gone on strike against working in the health-breaking prison jute mill. The strike caused them to be placed in the dungeon on bread and water. Jack Gaveel was the first to refuse to work in competition with free labour. He had never scabbed on his class outside of prison, he declared, and he wouldn't do it inside. The other I.W.W. members then quit work, and were put into the dark with Gaveel. They are in cells measuring 6 ft. by 12 ft., two or three in a cell, sleeping on a concrete floor, each on a dirty blanket. An open bucket in each cell is the sole sanitary convenience, and drinking water is in another open bucket, which gets stale as the hours pass.

Thirteen members of the United Miners' Association of America are being tried for the murder of John Major, a stockholder in the Union Shipping Company's mine, who was shot on June 29th, whilst endeavouring to operate the strip mine with blacklegs.

Major had been a Deputy-Sheriff for two years, but was unbanded by Sheriff R. T. Lynch on June 25th because of his violent talk against the miners and threat to lynch anyone who interfered with his employment of strike breakers.

Dominic Venturato, an Italian, who is president of the local branch of the mine workers, had gone with other comrades to plead with the blacklegs. Robert Farmer, a vice-president of the Union sub-district, had gone to the mine by another road for the same purpose. He was accompanied by a deputy-sheriff named Alec Hoffmann. They stationed themselves in the centre of the town about a quarter of a mile from the mine. Scores of men gathered to watch the efforts of the pickets. Several of them were strangers, with bulging hip pockets. Nobody seemed to know where they had come from. At least 150 spectators had gathered when two automobile-loads of strike breakers appeared.

The strike breakers were young farmers from near by. They became shamefaced when the pickets told them they were taking bread from the mouths of other workers and their families. Finally, they agreed to return to their homes.

Then a third automobile appeared, bearing John Major and his nephew, Clyde Major. Both were armed, as usual. The nephew drew his revolver. Several of the strangers with bulging pockets moved over alongside the mine operator's car. Major began arguing vehemently with the pickets. His nephew joined in the uproar.

Suddenly shots were fired from the automobile in which Major sat. Other shots were fired from many directions. Firing continued for what seemed a long time. Eye-witnesses say that at least seventy shots were fired. Clyde Major was slightly wounded, three of the Union miners were struck down by bullets, and John Major lurched over in his seat dying.

It is significant that he was shot twice in the back. Clyde Major jumped out of the car and ran for shelter. A big revolver, recognised as that of the uncle, was found beside John Major when his dead body was lifted out of the automobile.

Hoffmann telephoned to Sheriff Lynch telling what had happened. The Sheriff questioned various witnesses that day, but found no reason then to make any arrests.

Superintendent Elkins and his friends began to make demands for action, and two days later Dominic Venturato, Daniel Agosti, and Michael Muscelli were arrested by deputy-sheriffs and brought here to the county gaol. On July 8th and 10th a total of twenty-five men were arrested, and on July 18th a grand jury returned indictments against thirteen of them, including Robert Farmer.

At midnight on June 29th the residents of Oco, a small mining camp near Laferty, were notified that a mass meeting of protest had been held at Barnesville, a near-by town, immediately following the funeral of Major, which the farmers of adjacent towns were notified by letters to attend. After incendiary speeches designed to arouse race hatred, those present at the mass meeting, according to the report, had decided to march on the towns of Laferty and Oco and burn up both settlements.

Accordingly, the women and children in Laferty and Oco were sent out of town, and the miners armed themselves and mounted guard along the road for several miles in every direction, stopping all cars. This practice of guarding the two communities was kept up from June 29th to July 5th with full knowledge of the Sheriff's office.

On the first two nights truck-loads of Barnesville citizens started for Laferty, evidently to carry out their programmed errand of law and order, but they decided not to go through with their plan in view of the strong guard. As the week went on, miners came from Fairpoint, Dillonvale, and other communities, to the assistance of the Oco and Laferty workers, bringing plentiful supplies of arms and ammunition.

Four important attorneys of Eastern Ohio are defending the accused men. They are Earl Lewis and George Thornburg, of St. Clairville; E. S. Schertzer, of Bellaire; and John Gardner, of Steutenville. Their biggest problem to-day is to get time enough to prepare their defence and to locate all eye-witnesses of the shooting.

The defendants contend that no shots were fired by their side, that none of them was armed, and that they were present on a peaceable mission; they simply sought to persuade the strike breakers not to work.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOUNDED 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

THREE MONTHS (13 weeks) ... Post Free 2/6
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ... " " 5/5
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ... " " 10/10

Vol. IX. No. 25. Saturday, September 2, 1922.

THE HOUSE THAT WAS SEIZED. South Grove Eviction Case.

The case in which four ex-Service men, their wives, and sixteen children have taken possession of a house at 40 South Grove, Peckham, and are being tried under two statutes of Richard II. and one of Henry IV., came up for hearing at Lambeth Police Court on August 28th.

The summons, however, are taking so long to prepare under the ancient statutes that the prosecuting solicitor was obliged to report that after an adjournment of three weeks the documents are not ready yet. The action is proceeding under the instruction of the Master in Chancery. Apparently the procedure of affairs in Chancery is much what it was when Dickens wrote. The homeless people who have been in possession of the house since last December, have thus been given a further respite till August 31st, when the case will be heard at two o'clock.

Comrades should make a point of being present on that day. These comrades of 40 South Grove are fighting the battle of all working people who are left without adequate housing because it does not pay capitalists to invest money in working-class houses. They are facing both eviction and imprisonment: is there no movement to support them?

A number of big brawny lawyers, who looked like Rugby footballers, were seated on the solicitor's benches. Well dressed and well fed, they turned round to regard the four unemployed men in the dock with curious eyes. The magistrate gabbled through the arrangements, as though it were not of the slightest importance that the men in the dock, or their wives at the back of the Court, should understand what was being decided.

WHY THEY FIGHT IN IRELAND.

"May we not hope that Michael Collins' death will give pause to the fighters, and that, awaking to a sense of what they have lost, are losing, and are likely to lose, they will try a better way?"—Daily Herald.

The Daily Herald loses sight of the fact that the Irish desire a Republic. Mr. Lloyd George offered at the point of the sword a Treaty giving a limited measure of Home Rule within the Empire. Some of the Irish accepted the Treaty, others rejected it. The Lloyd George Government ordered the section which accepted the Treaty to make war on the section which rejected it. Those who want to stop the war in Ireland should bring pressure to bear on the British Government to scrap the Treaty and leave the Irish free to set up their Republic as they desire.

The Communists who support the Republican struggle are sound in their tactics, in so far as they help to undermine the power of capitalist government in Ireland. Capitalist power in Ireland is two-fold: it is the power both of British capitalism and of the Irish employers and small capitalists. With the power of the former removed from Ireland, the latter would be weak. The Irish workers might overcome it.

The question arises as to whether British capitalism would not at any time come to the aid of the Irish capitalists against the Irish workers, even were an Irish Republic adopted. Undoubtedly it would, but not so continuously and efficiently as if Ireland remained a part of the Empire. An Irish Republican Government, with its own national jealousies and prestige to consider, would not readily call for armed assistance from Britain. Moreover, the true position

would then be more clearly discernible by the workers on both sides of the Channel.

Those who desire to see Communism and a world federation of workers' Industrial Republics must welcome, and assist, so far as they can, the struggle of the workers towards that end wherever it may arise. These objects will not be achieved in a single night or a single fight. They will be the outcome of a prolonged struggle, in which not only will the opposition of the privileged classes be gradually surmounted, but the workers themselves and the whole people will gradually acquire fitness for the Communist Life with new ideals and habits and new administrative tasks.

Mr. George Lansbury, in the Daily Herald on August 6th, wrote:

"Lloyd George, Churchill, and Birkenhead, at the point of the bayonet, forced Arthur Griffith and Michael Collins to sacrifice their claim to an Irish Republic and accept the Free State constitution in its place. I believe they acted wisely. At least, if I were an Irishman, I would have signed and thus tried to end the strife of ages. . . .

"I believe the way out even now would be for the British Government to say to both sides in Ireland: Settle down and work the present 'Free State' constitution. If in a few years' time the Irish nation, through its own machinery of government, declares in favour of complete independence and a Republic, this country will not stand in the way, always provided Irish ports are not to be used in a hostile sense against this country."

These little paragraphs we receive as a straw showing which way the wind is blowing. Mr. Lansbury will have to move further yet, if he is willing to display any of the consistency, fairness, pacifism, and love of small nationalities he advocates in the abstract, and where other Empires than the British are concerned. Mr. Lansbury will have to advocate the abandonment of the Free State, if he desires to stand by the principles he professes. We think he is coming round to that, and he is a fairly good barometer of Liberal-Labour public opinion. We must not, however, look for action in that quarter.

The general eulogies of Michael Collins surpass those which were offered upon the death of Arthur Griffith. We are not surprised to find the Imperialist J. H. Thomas declaring Collins to have been the greatest of Ireland's sons, because Collins is regarded as having given his life to keep Ireland in the Empire. Prior to the truce, however, neither Mr. Thomas nor most of the others who are praising Collins to-day would have had much to say in his favour. To be friendly with Sinn Fein before the truce was called "shaking hands with murder."

Remember that, Communists, and if you have faith in your cause, hold firmly to it and do not flinch.

It is stated in the capitalist Press that it was the intention of Michael Collins to bring into the Free State Government such men as Devlin and others of the Irish Nationalist Party—the old reactionary Tory Nationalists who bitterly fought Sinn Fein, and have always opposed the Irish workers in their struggles.

The Labour Party members of Dail Eireann invited the Irish Labour Party Conference to pass a resolution that they should resign their seats in the Dail if it were not summoned by August 26th. It is now stated that the Dail will not meet, and that the Labour members will not resign. How well we know these glorious resolutions!

SOUTH AFRICAN TREASON TRIAL.

Shall the South African Strikers be Executed?

The General Council of the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party has discussed the resolutions sent to it by many Trade Union branches to take action of some sort, even if it be only by resolution, on behalf of the South African mine strikers who are being condemned to death by the Treason Court.

The General Council has been reluctant to do anything. It first decided upon a definite refusal; but afterwards decided to shelve the

matter by referring it to its Labour Research Department. The timorous officials there, with the sword of Hendersonian wrath hanging over their heads, have, according to the latest information, made no report.

The following Unions have cabled resolutions of protest to the South African Government:

The National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades Association.

The Transport and General Workers' Union.
The National Transport Workers' Federation.
The Amalgamated Engineering Union.
The Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers.
The National Society of House and Ship Painters.

The Electrical Trades Union.

The Amalgamated Marine Workers' Union.
London Society of Compositors.

National Union of Shop Assistants, Warehousemen, and Clerks.

LABOUR M.P. WANTS TO REDUCE WAGES.

Mr. Frank Rose, Labour M.P. for North Aberdeen, sits on the Select Committee on Estimates as a Labour nominee. He has a strong passion for economy, as is shown by his remarks in examining one of the Post Office officials who gave evidence to the Committee:

Mr. Rose:

640.—"With regard to the training of telephonists, the girl who comes in has some sort of education. Can you tell me how long it is, when a girl is taken as a probationer, before she earns money? Does she earn money directly? Is she put to some subsidiary sort of employment, some preliminary kind of employment?"

Answer—"A telephonist for about two months practically does no effective work at all. She is then put to the lightest part of the Exchange, where there are relatively few calls, and is gradually trained to take the full load."

641.—"With the exception of those two months she is earning money?"

Answer—"Yes."

642.—"The suggestion in some of the questions is that you ought to be able to do this thing a very great deal cheaper. I think you ought to be able to do it at half the price, because I do not see why these people should have a bonus now. Apart from that, things being equal, I quite agree personally that you have no right to carry on a business like the Post Office by trying to get the cheapest form of labour you possibly can. So long as you can get efficiency, and the labour is returning results, it does not matter much to me if you raise the price or not, but I do not think they ought to have a bonus. These girls as soon as they begin as probationers, or within two months, are beginning to return to their employer something in the way of production?"

Answer—"Yes."

643.—"It is a paying proposition after that?"

Answer—"We get back something after two months."

This demand for the cutting of wages is a strange one from the lips of a "Labour" member.

Housing Atrocities.

The Glasgow Medical Officer of Health states that 60 per cent. of the Glasgow population live in one or two-roomed apartments. This is what our great capitalist Empire does for its people!

DREADNOUGHT £500 FUND.

Brought forward, £264 13s. 11d. Hackney Meeting Collection, 2/1; Anon., £10; A. Gaubert, 2/-; Per Mrs. Cahill, 2/6; A Red, 2/-; Collections, Forest Gate Meeting, 1/3; Harlesden, 2/4. Total for week, £10 12s. 2d. Total, £275 6s. 1d.

MACHNO AND HIS BANDS.

One of the most sincere, useful, and well-informed books on Russia since the Revolution is by Augustine Souchy, and is entitled *The Workers and Peasants of Russia: How They Live*. It is published by the I.W.W. in Chicago for 30 cents, and may be obtained at the *Dreadnought Office* for 2/2.

From this book we take the following account of Machno's peasant army in the Ukraine, which throws considerable light on Russian problems and conditions:

The Truth About Machno.

At the time when the peasants in all parts of Ukraine rose against Skoropadski, and against the Germans and the Austrians, one man particularly distinguished himself among the leaders. This man is Machno.

Platon Machno was born in the village of Gulai-Pole in the gouvernement Alexandrov. As a young man he came into the Socialist movement. He was a partner publisher of the paper *Buro Vjestnik*. Not yet twenty years old, he shot a "Pristov," a member of the Russian Czarist secret police. He was condemned to death, pardoned to penal servitude for life, and banished to Siberia. The Revolution of 1917 released him. He was over ten years in exile. Through the sufferings and hardships of prison life he became consumptive. He is a small man, suffering in the highest degree and often afflicted by violent hemorrhages which overwhelm him while walking or speaking. By extraction and in his habits of life he is a peasant. He calls himself an anarchist, but is more of an Ukrainian peasant than a theoretical anarchist. And it is this that connects him with the peasants and makes him so popular and loved among them.

Machno and the Anarchists.

But if Machno has his Ukrainian peasant extraction in common with the peasants, the latter have anarchism in common with Machno. The Ukrainian peasants are attached to the Machno brand of anarchism with the strongest ties. Machno is, properly speaking, nothing but the theoretical expression of this peasant anarchism.

The anarchist theories contain negative and positive parts. The negative parts are anti-militarism, decentralisation and the negation of the State. The positive parts are the connection of the independent free communes into federative units, federalism, respect for the free personality in the necessary unification on the economic and political field.

The efforts of the Ukrainian peasants are covered by the negative parts of anarchism. The peasants do not want to recognise any Government. Theoretically expressed we could say that they deny the State. They combat the functions of the State: they do not want to become soldiers, they hate and abhor officialdom and bureaucracy, do not want to pay any taxes; in short, they take a hostile stand towards all the functions of the State. They are anti-militarists when up against the militarism of the State, but they defend their own freedom with all means. But even if the negative parts of anarchism are the most prominent parts of the anarchism of the Ukrainian peasant movement, this movement is not purely negative as a movement. The peasants are not theoretical, but rather sentimental anarchists. They have also showed, on different occasions, that they are capable of regulating their affairs in consonance with their libertarian tendencies, and even in the sense of Communism.

Why the Peasants Hate Governments.

If we now ask ourselves wherefrom these comparatively strong anarchist tendencies of the Ukrainian peasantry come, we can say that, besides the natural desire for liberty, the conditions of the last years of revolution and war have exerted a strong influence. Who will not be able to understand that a people will hate all political Governments when in the course of six years it has had thirteen different Governments, as the case was in some gouvernements, such as Kievsk, Poltava, and Berdiansk. But these Governments were all war Governments, and must consequently show themselves from the worst side. They requisitioned grain, horses, etc., from the peasants; in short, the peasants were for the Governments only the means of carrying on the war.

Although the Bolsheviks label the whole peasant movement, sometimes as anarchistic and sometimes as a common bandit movement, the anarchists in no manner identify themselves with the Machno peasant movement. And still a large part of the anarchists of Ukraine join the Machno peasant movement, in order to work for their ideas.

When Machno came from the prison in Siberia, he first stopped in Moscow. The rumours of the peasant massacres penetrated to Moscow and he went to Ukraine, and to his home place Gulai-Pole.

The following description of the development of the Machno movement comes not alone from his most intimate friends, his aids and comrades, but also from the Bolsheviks, who formerly served him as soldiers, but who later entered the Red Army and fought against Machno.

How Machno's Army Grew.

Machno organised the peasants against the Germans and against Skoropadski-Warta. There were in Gulai-Pole, a village of about 30,000 inhabitants, seven men who were good rebels. Among them were Machno, Tschubenko, and Gribelenko. They had some rifles, and took in the first day eighty Skoropadski soldiers prisoners. Besides, they took rifles and collected

money for a fighting fund, and for the first 3,000 roubles they bought a machine-gun, some bombs, and one revolver. Machno is a splendid fiery orator, and understood how to inspire the peasants to fight. Through his successes he became famous among the peasants, and was soon known in the whole gouvernement, and later in all Ukraine. From all sides the peasants gathered round him and wanted to serve under his flag. His power became stronger from day to day, and towards the end of the year 1918 he had an army of 50,000 or, according to some reports, 70,000 men.

Towards all other generals and adventurers the peasants stood sceptical. But not to Machno. The peasants loved Machno, and for him they voluntarily gave everything that the Germans and Skoropadski, as well as all other counter-revolutionary generals, could not get from them. Thus Machno was able to send thirty wagon-loads of foodstuffs to Moscow in December, 1918. The Moscow paper of the Bolsheviks, the *Isvestija*, then wrote very approvingly of Machno. Machno's army at that time held a front of over 300 kilometres (about 186 miles).

The Germans and the Austrians, as well as Skoropadski, were thus driven from the Ukraine by the peasants, principally under Machno. It was, consequently, not the Red Army, which came into existence only later, but the peasants themselves, who cleaned out Ukraine. This is a historic fact of great importance. It shows us that well-organised and great modern armies were conquered by peasants and peasant generals who had no military training whatsoever. Here we see repeated what we before have seen in history; the French peasants, after the revolution of 1789, threw back the invasion of the Prussians and the Austrians.

But the counter-revolution was not settled through the expulsion of the Germans, Austrians, and the Skoropadskis from the Ukraine. Not for a moment. France and England, as well as Roumania, who thereby got the danger of the revolution directly in their neck, were not at all suited by the fact that in Ukraine it was the peasants, the anarchists, and Bolsheviks who ruled. The aim of the entente was, and is up to the present time, to break down Soviet Russia and Soviet Ukraine.

From Podolia and from the East Galician frontier came Petljura, from the region of Don came Kaledin, and later Denekin took possession of the Don basin. Besides, a former Czarist, General Grigorjev, gathered dissatisfied peasants around him, and he succeeded in drawing to himself great numbers under pretence that he brought the peasants freedom.

The Denekin Menace.

The Bolsheviks in Moscow saw the danger which threatened them from Ukraine. In fact, Denekin later came far outside of Ukraine. He occupied Orel and stood before Tula, the last strategically important point before Moscow. But now the aim of the Soviet Government was to overthrow all other Powers in Central Russia and establish one single Soviet Power of the Communist Party. The peasant movement under Machno stood in the road of this policy. Economically they were dependent upon Ukraine. Central and North Russia needed Ukraine's grain and sugar. Central and North Russia is higher developed industrially than Ukraine, but through the War and the Revolution it was so impoverished that they were not capable of entering into purely economic exchange with an independent Ukraine, but had to amalgamate politically with that country. Besides, it would not do to allow Machno to become too strong, for just as well as Denekin, the Machno movement could crowd over into Central Russia. The position of the Bolsheviks regarding the situation in the Ukraine was also very vacillating. The reaction had to be beaten down. This could not be done without the Ukrainian peasants and workers. But these stood suspicious towards the Bolsheviks, although they went together with them in breaking down reaction. The Bolsheviks needed the peasants, but sought to become masters of their separatist libertarian movement.

The Bolsheviks and Machno.

The Bolshevik plans were that the peasant army of 50,000 to 70,000 men should be kept in Ukraine, and, as far as possible, held in inactivity. This could be accomplished quite painlessly. The lack of arms and ammunition, which already in the beginning of the risings developed such tragic effects, made itself again noticeable. That was one of the weakest points of the peasant army. This the Bolsheviks knew. Machno asked the Soviet Government for arms and ammunition. He turned to Debenko, the highest commander of the Red Army of Crimea. Debenko delayed the munitions shipment and gave him first in February, 1919, a single wagon-load of cartridges.

In order to discuss the situation, Machno called a conference of the peasants, which took place in Machno's birthplace, Gulai-Pole. This was a conference of revolting peasants. They are in Ukraine called "Povstanzj." These povstanzj are guerilla soldiers, rebellious peasants who fight in armed groups. The anarchists, left social-revolutionaries, and maximalists, in a resolution condemned the conduct of the Bolsheviks. But the peasants still had confidence in the Bolsheviks, and demanded the striking out of those paragraphs of the resolution which were directed against them. Still, the situation did not improve. The munition shipments became smaller and smaller. The leaders of the Machno army called a second conference in Gulai-Pole about the end of March. This conference was dissolved by the Bolsheviks.

The Bolsheviks now sent the anarchist Roschtschin-Grossman, professor of philology and philosophy at

the Moscow University, to Machno, in order to prevail upon him to join with the Red Army. Machno was to remain commander of his army but place his force under the Red Army. Machno, who was embittered by the conduct of the Bolsheviks, refused this on the ground that he did not want to work under those whose desire was to conquer power. And no change could be made in this position of his by the Bolsheviks sending him a wagon-load of paper.

From that moment began the war between the Bolsheviks and the Machno warriors. That it had to come to an open break between these two powers, lay in the very nature of these two armies. Here were two hostile principles which stood against one another. The principle of an army which was formed through compulsory mobilisation and naturally stood on centralistic ground, and on the other side peasants who had sprung together voluntarily, guerilla bands which were held together only for the moment through the hour of danger and through common suffering. With the former, iron discipline was a matter of fact; with the latter enforced discipline was a matter of taste. Machno, as the leader of the rebellious peasants, could never submit to the superior command of a high army commander. Even if he had personally desired to do so, the very nature of the army he commanded would not have permitted it.

The Machno army, which consists of revolting peasants, is no army in the military sense of the word. When the work in the fields begins, then the peasants go to tend to that work, and when the harvest begins they go out harvesting. Machno's army is, thus, anything but stable, and its strength varies extremely, according to circumstances and seasons. Also, the mode of fighting used by this army is fundamentally different from the methods used by the Red Army, drilled around the barracks. The rebellious peasants principally carried on a guerilla warfare. However successful a guerilla war may be, still it can never be the tactics used by a centralistically organised, militaristic national army. It is and remains the tactics of insurgents in a revolution, no more and no less.

Trotsky conceived the idea of annihilating Machno. Machno needed 5,000,000 cartridges. He had then about 50,000 men. According to Rieffkin, the leader of the maximalists, even 70,000 men. They sent him only half a million cartridges, and instead of 5,000 rifles, only 300. They prolonged the negotiations, in order to gain time, and thereby three to four days were lost. In the meantime Denekin kept advancing. Machno had no munitions, and had to retreat under terrible losses. Through the pressure the Red Army also was compelled to draw back. Machno's war committee wished to call a peasant conference, in order that they might take counsel in the situation. Even the second conference in Gulai-Pole was dissolved by the Bolsheviks. One must not think that there were unified, distinctly marked fronts, but one front ran into the other. Thus it came that a part of the riding messengers, who were to announce the conference to the peasants in the villages, were picked up and arrested in the region where the Red Army had a firm footing. The conference thus came to naught, and seven of these messengers were shot in Charkov as members of the revolutionary war committee.

Bolsheviks Fight Machno.

Trotsky was in Charkov and spoke on April 29th, 1919, in a meeting against Machno. He called Machno a bandit and a robber, and said that it would be better if the white guards took possession of Ukraine than to have it in the hands of Machno. For when the whites have come back, the peasants will call the Bolsheviks back. But if Machno remains in power, then the middle peasants will retain the upper hand.

On the ground of these theories the Bolsheviks decided to open the front at Josufka. At this place the Red Army was directly facing Denekin. The result was that Denekin's armies attacked Machno in the back. Machno, without munitions, attacked in the front as well as from the rear, had to retreat, but was completely defeated and lost the largest part of his army. With a few thousand men he succeeded in saving himself by fleeing. He retreated to the Dnieper region in the south-west.

But on this account the Red Army was also forced to retreat, and Denekin advanced still further. He took Charkov, penetrated into Central Russia, took Kursk and Orel, and even got as far as Tula.

The Bolsheviks said that Machno had committed treason, and they declared him outlawed. He was placed outside the law. His brother was discovered in a hospital, was taken for Machno, and murdered. Machno, who was accused of treason against the Red Army, should have thus acted to the advantage of Denekin!

These were the hardest days, not so much for Machno as for the Red Army. The peasants again gathered around him. Gulai-Pole and the capitals Jekaterinoslav, Mariopol, and Poltava fell into Machno's hands.

This was in the late summer and the fall of 1919. Machno became a danger to Denekin. Denekin's main army stood already in Russia; his rear guard was still in Ukraine. Machno cut the rear guard off from the main army and bound Denekin's transports of munitions and provisions up tightly in the South. Denekin was thus forced to retreat, and the Red Army took to the offensive. Most experts and participants in these struggles were of the firm conviction that Denekin then would have come to Moscow had Machno not frustrated his plans.

Bolsheviki Make Peace with Machno.

Through this decisive blow in a critical situation Machno again found favour with the Bolsheviks. The sentence hanging over his head was revoked, and he was no longer labelled a "counter-revolutionary."

While the Red Army was pressed back by Denikin's victorious army, a new reactionary Czarist general made his appearance in Ukraine: Grigorjev. He fought against the Bolsheviks, and promised the peasants freedom and the Soviet system, and he succeeded in gathering quite a large following.

Machno desired to know whose spiritual child Grigorjev was. He began negotiating with him. At one of these negotiations Machno killed him after he had learnt that Grigorjev was a reactionary. This also was counted in his favour by the Bolsheviks.

Between October 30th and November 1st, 1919, Jekaterinoslav fell from Denikin's into Machno's hands. As Denikin's main army, on account of Machno's exploits, was then compelled to retreat, it came from Central Russia down into Ukraine. What formerly had happened to Machno now happened to Denikin: he had no ammunition. Machno held Jekaterinoslav for a month. During this whole month parts of the Denikin army stood only 10 versts from Jekaterinoslav on the other side of the Dnieper. Machno could not get over, but neither could Denikin. He bombarded the city, but could not take it. Both of them, Machno and Denikin, bombarded the bridge across the Dnieper, in order to prevent the other from coming over. In December Denikin's North army, driven back by the Red Army, advanced upon Jekaterinoslav from the North side.

Machno Again Outlawed.

Machno was thus forced to turn back and retreat to Alexandrovsk. In the meantime, Denikin retreated still further, and the Red Army followed upon his heels. On January 10th and 11th the Red Army also arrived at Alexandrovsk. Trotsky now demanded that the peasants under Machno disarm. This they refused to do. It came again to conflicts, and Machno was once more outlawed. Part of his people were disarmed. He himself drew back his troops in the night and fled. From that time his power weakened. At the time the agricultural work had to be performed, in the spring and the summer of 1920, he had only a few thousand men. The Bolsheviks became more powerful in Ukraine and pursued him. He retreated to the woods between Poltava, Berdiansk, and Alexandrovsk.

The entente, particularly France, saw itself deceived in the hopes it had placed on the Denikin undertaking. But France did not yet surrender its hopes of making Ukraine the starting-point for its attack upon the Bolsheviks. It looked around for other hirelings, and found one in Baron Wrangel, "the white baron," as he is called in Ukraine and in Russia.

Through French support Wrangel became stronger. Especially after the war that broke out between Russia and Poland, Russia was compelled to concentrate its power against Poland, and could not occupy itself very much with Ukraine. The defeats of the Red Army on the Polish front weakened the position of the Bolsheviks in the Ukraine also. About the end of September the danger of the advance of the Polish Army was so great that the Bolsheviks again evacuated Kiev. Wrangel threatened the Don basin. Ukraine was not unlike a boiling kettle. Everywhere the peasants congregated and formed bands. These bands fought against the Poles, against the Bolsheviks, and also against Wrangel. Machno also became stronger again. As a few months before, the Bolsheviks had liberated West Ukraine from the Poles, who had taken Kiev and penetrated into the government of Poltava, the peasants looked upon the Bolsheviks as their liberators. To begin with, they got along quite well with the Soviet Government. But as the Bolsheviks later, through the protraction of the war, were forced to requisition provisions for the Red Army which fought against Poland, the harmony came to an end. The peasants began to fight also against the Bolsheviks, as before against the Poles. They became dissatisfied and rebelled, and, naturally, Machno was again their man.

The peasants fought against both Wrangel and the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks, in their turn, fought against Wrangel and Machno, but did not meet with any success. The peasants, including those who fought under Machno's banner, fought against all foreign troops that entered their territory. It was immaterial to them whether it was the Poles, Wrangel, or Bolsheviks. If they only succeeded in driving away the enemy they were satisfied. They did not pursue the beaten foe.

About this time Machno sent a note to the President of the Soviet Republic of the Ukraine, in which he laid claim to the governments of Jekaterinoslav and Cherson for himself and his followers, in order that the peasants might organise themselves as they desired. To this note Rakovsky did not give any answer. But the Bolsheviks spread the information: Machno works together with Wrangel.

Machno Fights Wrangel.

About the end of September, 1920, Machno's forces became considerably stronger. At this time the position of the Bolsheviks on the political front was most critical. Machno succeeded in carrying out some favourable operations against Wrangel. He took possession of Gulai-Pole, his native city, and soon also occupied Mariopol and Alexandrovsk. The Soviet Government, which only shortly before wrote in its papers that Machno co-operated with Wrangel, was compelled to report that Machno "now" again was operating against Wrangel. Machno again sent a note to the Soviet Government, in which he once

more demanded the freedom of Wollin and the rest of his friends. As Machno this time had power behind his words, the Bolsheviks were compelled to give in. On Friday, October 1st, 1920, Machno's friends, the theoretical anarchist W. M. Eichenbaum (Wollin), and Machno's aids, Tschubenko and Gabrilenko, were released from prison, where they had up to that time been held as hostages for Machno. At the same time Machno, who had been outlawed since January 13th, 1920, was pardoned. But on October 2nd and 3rd, 1920, there appeared in the Moscow *Izvestija* a report that the Red Army was making progress against Wrangel. Further, it also said that Machno again had united with the Red Army.

In the middle of November, 1920, Wrangel was almost completely beaten. It could be foreseen that the Red Army, which through the peace with Poland in Riga, had become free, would throw itself upon Wrangel and crush him. But the beginning of the end for Wrangel should be credited to Machno.

A Bolshevik paper published in English at Moscow (*Russian Press Review*, October 29th, 1920) says:

"The War Commissariat has published the following correction: The French Press has, as is probably known, written a good deal about Machno joining Wrangel. The Soviet Press, in its turn, has also published documents which have shown that a formal alliance existed between Wrangel and Machno. But it has now been ascertained that this information was not correct. . . ."

In regard to another statement, that the Machno forces indirectly had helped Wrangel when they fought against the Red Army, we have also to do with a conscious lie, for it was not the peasants under Machno which fought against the revolution. It was these peasants who made the revolution. It was when the centralistic Red Army wanted to rob the peasants of their freedom that the peasants rose against this new rulership also. Thus, it was not Machno who fought against the Red Army, but it was the Red Army who wanted to strike down the peasants under Machno who were insurgents.

It is quite sure, however, that the Bolsheviks, who now co-operate with Machno, will fight him again at their first opportunity, and then, perhaps, will annihilate him. But with Machno's person they have not killed the rebellious spirit of the peasants. Of course, it might happen that a general exhaustion of the peasants, a relaxing of the revolutionary tension sets in, and that then the peasant movement comes to an end. Therefore later historians of the revolution could, chronologically, connect these things, but between Machno's person and his eventual separation from the movement, and the revolutionary movement of the peasants on the other side, there is no casual connection.

If we now free ourselves from all party opinions and hold fast to the objective facts of the case, the following historic facts are undeniable. The Machno movement in Ukraine was originally a movement of the peasants against hostile invasion. The rebellious peasants did not content themselves with fighting against the Germans and Austrians, but in the course of their battle they turned against every Government. Their fight is a struggle for their own independence. Whether they are in a position to regulate their own affairs according to libertarian principles, that is a question of the greatest historic significance. But this question cannot be answered, solved, or decided through the different Governments who wished, and still wish, to get a footing in Ukraine. It exclusively depends on the peasants.

The Peasants Still Love Machno.

In spite of the means which the Soviet Government used in the struggle against Machno, they did not succeed in discrediting Machno before the population. The peasants honour and love Machno as one of their own, and there is hardly another man in all Ukraine who is so popular as Machno. The peasants gave him the surname Batkno, meaning Little Father. They have woven a wreath of stories about his head and relate the most incredible tales among themselves about Batkno. Machno is to them not a "Mister" (Gospodin), but their "Little Father" (Batkno). No matter what dangers Batkno throws himself into, he always comes out of them whole, as by a wonder. Because Machno had such great armies that were always dissolved again, only in order to rise up anew; because he had to flee so often, but always came back again, the peasants said that Batkno could not be defeated. There is a tale that Batkno was in Denikin's camp and in his tent. He was disguised, and talked with Denikin. Suddenly he said: "I am Machno," and disappeared. As a sample of Machno's tactics, it is said that when he has taken a place he orders one or several houses vacated, and then pretends that he is to live there. When evening comes he goes disguised into some other village and sleeps there without being known. Another tale about Machno is: In some village a small, insignificant peasant (that is how Machno looks) sells a dish of butter. The buyer, who gets the dish also, can, when he gets home, find the following words on the plate: "He who bought this butter has seen Batkno-Machno."

Such a figure of story and myth is Machno in the mind of the peasants. For that reason it is plain that the Machno movement finds better response and reception than all the Government troops coming from the outside. When Machno needs horses, provisions, or rather material of war, the peasants generally give to him voluntarily what others cannot get with force. It needs only to be said that "Batkno needs it," and it is given without question.

The logic of the peasants is very simple: We want to live for ourselves, and not be disturbed. Who

comes to us and wants to rule over us will be slain and his property will be distributed.

To have thrown the peasants upon this primitive, savage, uncultivated level, through which the cultural development not only was stopped but set back, that is the work of those who lit the flame of the world war. The blame for this brutalising of men falls upon them.

The conditions under which the Machno army declared itself prepared to fight together with the Red Army against Wrangel were laid down in the form of a pact on October 16th, 1920, which was signed by the former Hungarian People's Commissar Bela Kun and by a representative of the Machno army.

After these agreements were entered into it became possible to conquer Wrangel's white armies, owing to the co-operation between the Red Army and the Machnovtzi. But after the victory of the Red Army the Soviet Government broke these agreements and started a merciless battle against the Machno detachment. And all anarchists of Ukraine were again put in prison.

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.**"THE ORIGIN OF THE WORLD."****"A BOOK FOR CHILDREN."**

By Robert McMillan.

REVIEW BY TOM ANDERSON.

To the girls and boys of the Empire I recommend Robert McMillan's book. It is one of the finest books published for the young. There are twenty-two chapters in it and 139 pages, and it is all very wonderful. It is also a good book for the average man and woman. If the workers of the country would make a study of this book for one winter something might happen; at any rate, many would see the world in a different light. The book was published in 1914, and it has had an enormous sale. You can get it from the *Workers' Dreadnought* Office. Price, post free. 3/4 cloth, 1/9 paper.

How to read the book:

A class is best. Get a few boys and girls into a reading circle, at ages, say, twelve to eighteen, and old people may come if they so desire. Read a chapter aloud; and if everyone can have a copy, so much the better. Then let the teacher of the circle call for questions, and you will be surprised at the results.

I have had this book read through at one of our schools. Instead of having a speaker giving a lesson, we took this book up as a fixed lesson on the last Sunday of each month, and I selected two girls and two boys, ages twelve to fifteen years, to read a chapter. In this way we went round all the girls and boys in the schools. Questions were asked and answered. At this school we had an attendance of thirty grown-ups, or more, and they were all deeply interested in the chapter as read by the girls and boys.

The book is written in very simple language, so that any young child can understand it. Let me quote you a few passages:

"Perhaps you have learned to sing, as I did when very small,

'Twinkle, twinkle, little star,' etc.

"But the stars are not small. They are large, very large, bigger than our sun; and every star you see in the sky is a sun.

"Shall I tell you how far our sun is from Australia? It is over 92,000,000 miles!

"Our great big sun is 1,500,000 times bigger than our earth.

"The star Canopus is a million and a-half times bigger than our sun. Our 'great big sun' is only half a star baby.

"There is no such thing as a 'sky,' but I have to say 'sky' so that you may understand me when I speak about things that appear to be above us. But what is above us?

"Nothing at all! What is all about us? Space—But space is nothing? Yes, space is also nothing. Outside of this little world of ours there is no 'up' or 'down,' or 'east' or 'west,' or 'north,' or 'south,' or any direction at all.

"Light travels at the rate of 180,000 miles a second—you ought to make a note of that, for it is terribly upsetting. It would take a ray of light, then, three and a-half years to reach the nearest star.

"The distance of the next star to it might be sixty 'light years' off, or a hundred 'light years' off. There are stars known to science now that are distant a thousand years from us.

(Continued on p. 8)

THE BREAKDOWN OF OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

(Continued from last week.)

It would be a gross error to imagine that the decline of foreign imports is mainly due to high protective duties, and that therefore the Russians pay for everything much dearer than the West Europeans. The decline of imports is much better explained by the growth of home industries. The protective duties have no doubt contributed (together with other causes) toward attracting German and English manufacturers to Poland and Russia. Lodz—the Manchester of Poland—is quite a German city, and the Russian trade directories are full of English and German names. English and German capitalists, English engineers and foremen, have planted within Russia the improved cotton manufactures of their mother countries; they are busy now in improving the woollen industries and the production of machinery. But there is not the slightest doubt—and this opinion is shared by several Russian manufacturers—that the Russian industries having already taken firm root, a free-trade policy would not check their further growth. And then let us imagine that absolutism is overthrown, and Russia conquers some more political freedom. A further growth of industries would immediately follow. The change may come in a more or less pacific way, or under the thunders of a peasant revolution. But, however the different results in each case for the masses of labourers—capitalist production in one case, and free industry in the other case—a further and rapid development of industry would be the consequence of the change. Technical education—which, strange to say, has been systematically suppressed until now by the Government—would rapidly grow and spread; and in a few years, with her natural resources and her laborious youth, Russia would soon see her industrial powers increase tenfold. She *farà de sè* on the industrial field. She will manufacture all she needs; and yet she will remain an agricultural nation. At present only one million of men and women out of eighty millions population of European Russia work in manufactures, and seven and a-half millions combine agriculture with manufacturing. The figures may treble without Russia ceasing to be an agricultural nation; but if they treble there will be no room for imported manufactured ware, because an agricultural country will have her manufactured goods cheaper than those countries which live on imported food.

The same is still more true with regard to other European nations, much more advanced in their industrial development, and especially with regard to Germany. So much has been written of late about the competition which Germany offers to British trade, even in the British markets, and so much can be learned about it from a mere inspection of London shops, that I need not enter into lengthy details. Several articles in Reviews; the correspondence exchanged on the subject in the *Daily Telegraph* in August 1886; numerous Consular reports, regularly summed up in the leading newspapers, and still more impressive when consulted in originals; and, finally, political speeches, have familiarised the public opinion of this country with the importance and the powers of German competition. And the forces which German industry borrows from the high technical training of her workmen, engineers, and scientific men have been so often brought to the front by the promoters of the technical education movement that the causes of the sudden growth of Germany as an industrial Power ought to be well known. Where decades were needed before to develop an industry, a few years are sufficient now. Five and twenty years ago, only 8,300 metric tons of raw cotton were imported into Germany, and 830 tons of cotton were exported; cotton spinning and weaving were mostly insignificant house industries. In 1884 the imports of raw cotton reached 180,000 tons, and the exports of cotton goods 25,000 tons. In nine years—that is, between 1875 and 1884—the number of spindles in the woollen trade had doubled; and while 100,000 metric tons of raw wool were imported, the export of manufactured woollens reached 21,000 tons in 1884. While

pointing out very frankly several secondary drawbacks of German manufactures, Dr. Francke (*Die Neueste Entwicklung der Textilindustrie in Deutschland*) maintains that the German woollens are not inferior to the British, and they really compete with them in British markets. The above rate of increase is already speedy enough; but the flax industry grows at a still speedier rate, so that out of the 2,700,000 flax spindles which Europe had in 1884, Germany counted 300,000. In the silks with her 87,000 looms and a yearly production valued at £9,000,000, she is second only to France. It is only in the art of making the finest cotton yarns that Germany remains behind England; but Herr Francke believes—and we, too—that the disadvantage will soon be equalised. New manufactories, supplied with better machinery, are already being started. And the next step will be, we are told, to emancipate the German cotton manufactures from the Liverpool traders—and “rings”—by importing raw cotton directly from where it grows. The progress realised in the German chemical trade is well known, and it is only too strongly felt in Scotland and Northumberland. As to the German machinery works, if they have committed the error of too slavishly copying English patterns, instead of taking new departures and creating new patterns, as the Americans did, we still must recognise that their copies are excellent, and that they very successfully compete in cheapness with English machines and tools. I hardly need mention the superior make of German scientific apparatus. It is well known to scientific men, even in France.

In consequence of the above, the imports of manufactured goods into Germany are declining. The aggregate imports of textiles (inclusive of yarn) stands so low as to be nearly compensated by nearly equal values of exports. And there is no doubt that, not only the German markets for textiles will be soon lost for other manufacturing countries, but that German competition will be felt stronger both in the neutral markets and those of Western Europe. It is very easy to win applause from uninformed auditors by exclaiming with more or less pathos that German produce can never equal the English! The fact is, that it competes in cheapness, and sometimes also—where it is needed—by an equally good workmanship; and this circumstance is due to many causes: to the relative cheapness of life; to a widely spread technical or, at least, concrete scientific education; to the possibility of establishing manufactures according to the very last models of the best English manufactures; and especially to the period of awakening in all branches of activity which Germany is now experiencing after her long period of slumber. This remarkable awakening may be witnessed in all directions: in literature and science, in industry and trade, in the growth of new ideals; and if more inventive genius, more originality, are still desirable, it must be recognised that with regard to the energy displayed for applying achieved results, Germany offers now a really grand spectacle.

THE APOSTLE.

By GUY A. ALDRED.

(One of many MSS. written in Barlinnie Prison, Glasgow.)

CHAPTER II.

(Continued from last week.)

The wonder of it filled and inspired the Apostle. It took possession of him and enthused him with the gospel and the awe of the streets. Here was his fatherland. In the forum assembled his own people, and slowly he became assured of his place in its councils. All the greatness that dwelt within him, all his love and tenderness, all his scorn for wrong and injustice were developed into convinced and conscious feeling. The word of the gutter that had thrilled the poor since first poverty dwelt among men was hammered into his thought by constant discussion and debate. Justice, as George Eliot says, filled his soul as a great yearning—and he knew that the Kingdom of God, which is but the love of man, dwelt within him. But

he knew also, as Jesus said, that the Kingdom of God was among the people who forgathered in the forum to urge their wrongs and consider their thoughts—among them and without, as well as within his individual soul. He knew the outward dwelling was the greater temple: for from without he derived his wisdom and understanding that consecrated and devoted him within. The forum was not his school only: it was his church. He felt it to be the direct heir to the glory and the witnessing power of the early ever-present Church that Jesus founded in the open air whenever two or three were gathered together. Moodily as he tramped between the park and his home in Clerkenwell he would contrast the two great tendencies of the ages—Caesarism and Communism.

Communism is of the people. It means a common right to satisfy from common wealth our common needs. It implies no trespass on the rights of the individual and his liberty of conscience. It recognises the right of solitude, but rejoices in the commune of exchanged ideas.

What reputations Plato has made! Divines, whose sermons and ministrations happily are forgotten, live for ever in the pantheon of culture because they had the inspiration to translate Plato and to dispute about his meaning. Judges have earned fame for their judicial decisions because of wise selections. Pray tell me, my masters, what he did, that you may adorn your divinity with his association and point your legal moral with his wisdom. To be sure, he reported the defendants' speeches in a State trial for blasphemy and sedition, and declined to publish the case for the prosecution. For the latter he showed an excellent and most proper contempt. One hardly expects the bench to appreciate this candour of the dock, however. He idealised the case for the defence and amended and touched up the defendant's apology. This showed a nice appreciation of the prisoner's lasting importance. I should have thought such conduct too ominous for authority to pander to its classic wit. Plato never scrupled about attributing his own thoughts to Socrates, whom he disciplined and improved. Perhaps this appeals to the scholastic sense of theological forgery and taste for judicial perversion of text and context. Only Plato's improvement favoured a Social Republic, communal responsibility for child welfare, sexual equality, and free love, my masters.

When modern Communists urge such ideas the scholars and the lawyers cry out for more and more drastic measures of persecution. When Plato speaks of such things they ignore his conclusions, or else dismiss them with a casual suggestion of relative unimportance. It is amusing to watch their squirmings and to note their evasions whilst endeavouring to reconcile their first-rate outlook with their tribute to the wisdom of a third-rate seer.

I do not say that Plato's Republic was identical with the Communists' Republic of to-day. I do not say that his free love exactly agreed with their conception. I claim that he was treading the same third-rate track and that his vision was on the same level as theirs. I claim that it is a vision of higher and loftier morality than that urged or favoured since by the Christian moralists or apologists. In any case, it is third-rate; and the eulogy of its authors by the scholars is a further evidence of the immortality and the eternal glory of the thinker and the prophet of the third rate.

Come now to Luther, “the monk who shook the world” by discovering that one did not need to purchase indulgences from the Pope in order to live without fear. He took for his motto the text: “The just shall live by faith.” A splendid motto, that so encouraged and inspired this despised and ex-communicated monk that he destroyed a spiritual and temporal despotism. He proclaimed the knowledge of a greater Jesus than that known to the Pope, whose bull he burnt; a Jesus truer to history and to fact, because a Jesus of humanity and revolt. What was this Luther but a third-rate man? As third rate as the Karl Liebknecht who was directly descended from him and perished on the streets an apostle of the twentieth century, a martyr unto the glory of man.

(To be continued.)

HUNGER.

People are indignant, fellow-worker, because young Frank Emery has been sent to prison for six months for taking sixpennyworth of apples when he was hungry.

But what you and I ought to be angry about, fellow-worker, is that Frank Emery, or anyone else, should be hungry, and unable to satisfy that hunger in a land of plenty.

Apples, fellow-worker; why, we could grow so many apples in this country that millions of them would hang on the boughs till they dropped unwanted. There is no reason for a scarcity of apples, or of anything else, fellow-worker, that human labour can produce and human beings require to use.

We should be angry that anyone should go hungry, and that any should deny food to their fellow-creatures.

We should be angry, fellow-worker, that Frank Emery, like millions of other workers, should be prevented from practising his useful trade; that he should be denied the tools and the material required for the shoes he is qualified to make, whilst people are needing shoes to wear, and whilst there is no scarcity either of tools or leather.

Some people are making the fact that young Emery is in prison a peg on which to hang an agitation to get rid of the Home Secretary, Mr. Short, and to put some other person into his office.

But you and I, fellow-worker, must look more deeply into the matter: we must see that it is not a question whether this man or that man, whatever party he may belong to, is Home Secretary, or even Prime Minister: it is a complete change of system that is required.

Frank Emery is only one of millions who are in need of food and necessities, of which an abundant supply can be provided in order that all may enjoy them. Whether Frank Emery is released from prison to-day or to-morrow, or whether he serves his sentence to the full, he will come out to the same life of struggle and unemployment, the same blighting poverty and want that he suffered from before he went to gaol. Frank Emery's case, as you know, fellow-worker, is no exception; there are many thousands of men and women in this country whose position is identical with his.

What we require; what we must work for; what we must get excited and enthusiastic about is a change of system: the overthrow of the capitalist system.

"And after that?"

After that, fellow-worker, the workers' Republic: the Republic in which all shall be workers and the classes shall disappear.

What to Strive for:

The abolition of capitalism.

The abolition of the wage system.

The abolition of money, buying and selling, and barter.

The abolition of masters and servants.

The abolition of rich and poor.

The abolition of Parliament.

The free use by all of the abundant production of the community.

The common ownership of the land, the means of production, transport, and distribution.

The Soviets as the means by which industry, distribution, and transport may be administered.

"What are the Soviets?"

Before the revolution the Soviets will be called the One Big Revolutionary Union, built up from the workshops, covering all industries.

When the revolution comes they will take control.

After the revolution they will carry on.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

CAPITALISM v. COMMUNISM.—Cont. from p. 2.

Can anyone doubt that the growth of general poverty, the housing shortage, and the vast unemployment here will fail to produce the symptoms in Britain which poverty and lack of housing are producing in Germany?

Puerperal fever and suicide, especially amongst women, are on the increase in Germany.

Housing.

Dr. Hahn gives some striking figures in regard to housing. In 1921 no less than one and a-half million persons in Germany were, he estimates, seeking for shelter. The number of new buildings set up in 1913 was 54,702; in 1921 it was only 21,273, or 61 per cent. less. This number was much greater than the number of buildings erected in 1919 and 1920, whilst there was, of course, a virtual cessation of building from 1914 to 1919. Considerably more than half the dwellings built in 1920 and 1921 were erected by public bodies.

The Social Wage.

One of the desperate expedients for bolstering up capitalism in Germany is called "the social wage," which, like our Poor-Law doles, is based on the size of the wage-earner's family. The Employers' Association take over the liability for the increased wage paid to the man with a family to support, and meets the difference between the wage of a married and unmarried worker from a common fund.

Such expedients will presently be advocated here by those who desire to stave off the breakdown of capitalism.

Dr. Kahn advocates that this method of "promoting large families should be transferred to international life."

These capitalist politicians refuse to think beyond the immediate interests of their pocket. The British capitalists are all for reducing the

number of workers because the British £ is up and British industry is depressed, while the German capitalists are all for increasing the working-class population because the German manufacturer has plenty of work to do at a low price.

More British Figures.

John Brownlee, M.D., D.Sc. (Director of Statistics, Medical Research Council), contributes a paper on "The Census and its Lessons." Like Mr. Keynes, he fears the growth of population. If the birth-rate remains constant, he says, our population will be 455,500,000 in England and Wales, and this he pronounces unsafe. He scarcely considers whether food to support this population can be provided at home or imported from abroad, and mainly discusses the prospect of employment, saying that many more individuals cannot be employed on farm lands because the better agriculturists will substitute motor traction for horse traction, and artificial manure for horse manure. Some people might be employed in forestry or in the breeding of fur-bearing animals, he says, but not many.

For the sixty or seventy years prior to the War the increase of population in England and Wales was about 3,000,000 in each ten years. In the last ten years it was about 2,500,000. The emigration in that ten years was about 630,000, and about 630,000 people were killed in the War.

The 1921 census shows an increase in the active population of 5 per cent., as against an increase of 20 per cent. in the population over seventy years. Dr. Brownlee deprecates this, but his only solution is more emigration, though he admits "it is obvious that this will increase the burden of old age in this country." "It is rather sad to think this is what we have to look forward to," he says, but if the young and the statesmen do what he conceives to be their duty

"there will be a stream of young and vigorous life to people other lands," and British Colonies will not have to accept an alien population.

Birth control Mr. Brownlee will not touch; he regards it as a rash proceeding, since the fertility of married women had fallen from 100 to 73 by 1910-12; it has now probably fallen to 65, and should it fall any lower, the population would begin to reduce and the reduction might be progressive.

That seems a conclusive answer to all the Malthusians if Dr. Brownlee's figures are correct.

The fact is, dear readers, birth control has been practised by the people individually throughout the ages, and short of a Herod-like extermination or sterilisation of girl children Governments cannot do it.

The Way Out.

The war-time enthusiasm for increased food production plays no part with these capitalist politicians now that it is no longer a question of winning a capitalist war, but only of finding food for the working class. In spite of the great output of human energy on the battlefields and in the equipment of the armies, considerable progress was made during the War with the production of food in this country. The following statistics relating to England and Wales are provided by the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture, and show the war-time increase:

1914.—Wheat, 7,307,000 quarters; barley, 6,174,000 quarters; oats, 9,554,000; beans, 1,084,000 quarters; peas, 372,000 quarters; potatoes, 2,953,000 tons; turnips and swedes, 13,451,000 tons; mangolds, 7,919,000 tons; hops, 507,000 tons. Total, 49,271,000.

1918.—wheat, 10,530,000 quarters; barley, 6,080,000 quarters; oats, 14,339,000 quarters; beans, 889,000 quarters; peas, 439,000 quarters; potatoes, 4,209,000 tons; turnips and swedes, 12,018,000 tons; mangolds, 8,231,000 tons; hops, 130,000 tons. Total, 57,065,000.

Plenty of food can be provided in the world to feed the world's populations for many a generation to come; but only Communism will ensure that the food reaches the people.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.—Cont. from p. 6

"And this fathomless abyss of space is what you thought was the sky. But there is no 'sky.' There is no end, no beginning, and no 'sky.'"

This, then, is a really wonderful book for girls and boys and grown-ups. It unfolds a romance for the mind a million times greater than all the fairy-tales ever published.

I have been asked times out of number what to teach girls and boys, by comrades interested in our school movement. What better could you have for a start than this book? Nothing, in my opinion; and it gives you a groundwork to build your other lessons on. And, as you know, we live in this world, and this world is one of wonder, so wonderful that we "blind ants" cannot see it.

If our dear friend Sir John Butcher, Bart., M.P., has not included this book in his "Sedition Bill," he should do so at once, for there is more "sedition" in this book than anything published by the Proletarian Schools. This book is one of our text-books, and I trust the Church will soon warn its members not to read it.

There is no "sky," and we were all taught we were going up there by-and-by. There is no "up there," and no "down below." No "good" place or "bad" place. This is terrible! What will we do with the "bad" people? I don't know; do you? Nobody knows. For there is no "sky," no place to go to. Fancy when you die, "being all dressed up and nowhere to go," or having to journey 1,000 years in "space." Possibly the time will come when we won't die. That, of course, would solve the problem.

But you just fancy the men who wear their collars the wrong way, teaching this book in school. Some day they will. These men don't believe what they teach to-day. They have to. And poor Sir John Butcher, Bart., M.P., has a "Sedition Bill." I hope he gets it passed. The Church will murder him.

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