

If you like it buy it every week.

Workers' Dreadnought

Founded and Edited by SYLVIA PANKHURST.

VOL. IX. No. 43.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 1923.

Weekly—PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE BOLD BUCCANEER.

By Grant Allen.

'Twas a bold buccaneer, and he strode the street

In a smooth silk hat and a long frock coat;
And close to his club he chanced to meet
A brimming bard, with a tremulous throat.
Clad round his limbs, as a bard should be,
In the garb of the aristocracy.

The singer, he seized the warrior's hand;
His pulse beat high, that grasp to feel.
"And you come," he cried, "from a distant land,
That rings with the clang of your clashing steel!
Nay, tell me your doughty deeds," said he,
"To enshrine in immortal poesy!"

To-day, as of old, will our champions take
Their lives in their hands, where the battle is keen:
You fought and bled, like Raleigh or Drake,
For old England's fame, to serve your Queen.
"Well, not exactly that," said he;
"We fought for a Limited Company."

The bard he winced, but his soul was high;
For to break the letter is not to sin.
He thought to himself of Nelson's eye;
And of Hawkins who disobeyed, to win.
"There were maidens and babes to save," said he,
"When you dashed on your raid, beyond the seal"

The bold buccaneer, he eyed him hard,
With a delicate quiver about the lid.
He saw in his soul that the well-dressed bard
Mistook the note of your modern Cid.
" 'Twas our stocks and shares, you know," said he,
That stood in particular jeopardy."

The poet, he heaved a quiet sigh.
"Yet, still, 'twas a glorious cause," he cried.
"For your country's sake you strove to die."
The bold buccaneer, he stepped aside.
"You don't understand finance," said he;
" 'Twas the glorious cause of £ s. d."

DREADNOUGHT BOOK CLUBS AND READING CIRCLES.

Comrades are invited to form autonomous reading groups, open to all shades of proletarian thought.

Membership cards for each group will be provided, if desired, on payment of 6d. to cover postage.

Books may be obtained on easy terms. Particulars on application to the "Dreadnought" Bookshop, 152 Fleet Street, E.C.

Courses of study on history, economics, literature, science, etc., recommended to groups and individuals.

DESIRABLE MANSIONS,

By Edward Carpenter.

Price 4d.

This forms part of a larger work entitled "England's Ideal," published by George Allen and Unwin, price 2/6 limp, and 3/6 cloth. This work may also be obtained at the "Dreadnought" Bookshop.



Fascisti triumph over their destruction of the People's House (Headquarters of the Trade Unions, Co-operative, and Socialist Societies) at Ferrera, in the province of Pavia, Italy.

Boycott.

In Chicago's darkened dungeons,
For the O.B.U.,
Remember you're outside for us,
While we're in here for you.

Fellow-workers of Britain,—

Sixty-four members of the I.W.W. are still kept in the unsanitary dungeons of the United States, serving sentences of from five to 2 years' hard labour for their anti-war opinions.

Two of these fellow-workers are slowly dying as a result of bad treatment in gaol. These two cannot be saved now, but the rest can if you want them to live. Remember that these men are in there solely because they tried to organise their own class.

If these fellow-workers are allowed to rot in the American dungeons without protest from organised Labour in this country, they will be shamefully betrayed by their own class, and you, fellow-workers of Britain, will be just as responsible for their fate as the masters.

Seamen and Dockers,—

You are able to give the first aid, fellow-workers of Britain, in the fight for their release by boycotting American ships, cargo and goods.

Refuse to load or unload any American ship!

Refuse to sign on any American ship!

Refuse to touch anything arriving from or bound to United States of America!

Fellow-workers of all trades,—

Boycott tools made in the United States of America. Boycott American clothes, cigarettes, or anything made either in America or by American concerns here in England!

Declare a world-wide boycott on the United States of America until every political prisoner is released from the gaols and guarantee is given that the cold-blooded murder of members of our class shall be stopped.

An injury to one is an injury to all.

On behalf of the General Defence Committee,

N. G. SODERBERG (Card No. 1384, B.A.).

THE TYRANNY OF THE UNITED STATES.

According to J. N. Beffel, of the I.W.W. Defence News Service, employers of the United States are growing worried over the falling of the immigration of European workers to the United States and the steady return of alien workers to their native lands. A systematic propaganda for the revision of the immigration restrictions has therefore begun, under the carefully devised slogan of "quality rather than quantity."

The Mussolini Government of Italy has promised, says Beffel, to co-operate with the United States in providing "quality immigrants" for U.S.A., and proposes to sift out

the good people from the bad at the point of departure. Italy, it is said, can send six or seven million people to the United States.

During the year ending June 30th, 1922, immigration into the United States only totalled, it is said, 68.3 per cent. of the

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

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

The high cost of production of the paper necessitates prompt payment

number admissible under present restrictions, which limit the number of aliens of any nationality admissible in one year to 3 per cent. of the persons of that nationality already resident in the States in the year 1910. 356,999 people would have entered the States last year; only 243,953 came; whilst 198,712 persons emigrated. The Wall Street Journal laments that there was actually a net reduction of 10,000 men, for the surplus of immigration over emigration consisted of women and children only.

Mr. R. C. Marshall, Jr., general manager of the Associated General Contractors of America, writes:

"We find ourselves confronted by a Labour shortage and rising Labour costs. Throughout our history the main source of our common labour has been immigration. Skilled mechanics are not replaced from native sources as fast as they are eliminated by disability or death."

That is a remarkable statement. It throws a striking light on the "Great Democracy of the West," the Home of the Brave and Free. Would Mr. Marshall care to rechristen his native land **The Death Trap of Labour?**

Mr. Marshall continues:

"The skilled American workman is not usually succeeded by his son. His place is often taken by the son of a foreign-born common labourer, so to restrict the supply of common labour is also to reduce the number of skilled workers."

"In construction alone, we need approximately 35,000 new skilled workers and 12,000 common labourers annually, merely to replace those lost by death or other causes."

The mechanical and manufacturing industries require, according to Mr. Marshall, 214,000 new workers annually to replace those lost by death and retirement, and 154,000 to meet the increased production required by the growth of population, making a total of 368,000 new men required annually in these industries.

Mr. Marshall declares that too many of the immigrants belong to the commercial and trading classes; too many are "feeble-bodied men of the clerical class." What America needs, he says, is "the sturdy, honest common labourer type." The educational conditions which exclude people who cannot read and write he regards as "well intentioned," but "not working out as intended." He wants restrictions, but not such restrictions—in short, he wants to make sure of obtaining muscle and brawn.

Why are the workers of Europe now ceasing to flock to America, in spite of the unemployment and unexampled poverty which are devastating their home lands?

J. N. Beffel declares the reason to be that the United States has become the country, of all countries, in which the workers are most persecuted. It is abhorred by the workers of the world, as Siberia was abhorred in the days of the Czar.

The tale of continued detention of 64 war-opinion prisoners, the Mooney and Billings frame-up, the Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Centralia tragedy, the Everett massacre, the murder of women and children by gunmen at Ludlow, the mine war at Herring, and a host of other onslaughts upon the labouring masses, is finding its way from country to country, and wherever the news travels the workers come to think of America with hatred and aversion.

Federal Judge George Page, of Chicago, in an I.W.W. deportation case, recently decided that the guarantees in the United States constitution are applicable solely to citizens and not to aliens who are admitted solely by courtesy, and whilst subject to all the penalties of law-breaking, are not protected by constitutional assurances. In the case in point, five alien workers had served sentences of five years' imprisonment for war opinions, and were subject to deportation, under an amendment passed by Congress after they had been

convicted. According to the constitution, this was illegal; but Judge Page decided that the protection of the constitution does not apply to aliens.

A recent speech of Dr. Harry Garfield, President of Williams College, and Federal Fuel Administrator during the war, revealed the opinion of American Capitalism with amazing candour. He said:

"Unskilled workers have no right to demand a living wage that would allow them to marry and support families. If such workmen want to marry it is up to the wife to work also. . . . The unskilled employee, whether in workshop or office, ought not to receive in wages more than enough to keep him in good working condition."

FRANK PENMAN IN LONDON.

"You Communists," said Saunders, "would do away with the incentive to initiate. That is the weakness of your system."

"You are absolutely wrong," Frank Penman snapped impatiently, taking up the previous evening's "Star" and pretending to be too much engrossed in it to talk any more.

"Where would you get your inventors?" Saunders continued unperturbed. "Now I have a friend who has just invented something: would he have taken the trouble to invent it if he hadn't have hoped to make a little bit out of it? Certainly not. He would not have taken that trouble."

"Most people would if they knew how, I believe," said Miss Mayence, "but will your friend make anything out of his invention?" "As a matter of fact," answered Saunders, smiling, "that is just what is worrying him. He ain't so sure about it. Indeed, he's beginning to have the very gravest doubts. You see, he has got to find someone with money to help him to bring it out. He thought it 'ud be easy at first, and so did I: it's a very ingenious contrivance; but up to date he hasn't found anybody willing to take the risk."

"Things aren't exactly ideal for the inventor under the present system, then?" Penman threw out, shrugging his shoulders.

"What is your friend's invention?" Miss Mayence asked.

"I don't know," answered Saunders, "whether I ought to tell."

"Oh, we won't steal it; it will be quit safe to tell us," she persuaded.

"Well, I'll tell you this much; it's an improvement in waterproofs. I don't know as I ought to say any more."

"If it's anything to do with their chemical composition I shouldn't be any the wiser," Miss Mayence said, "but what is the effect of it? Does it make them more waterproof?"

"Well, no, not exactly; only it stops the drip. You know it's the drip that causes all the trouble. It's the drip running off at the bottom that wets your trousers, and the drip running down the sleeve that wets your wrists. That's how people get rheumatism and all sorts of illness."

"How does it stop the drip?"

"Now how do you suppose?"

"I can't think."

"Well, it wouldn't do for the material to soak up the rain, would it? Then you'd be carrying it about with you, wouldn't you, like you do with a rough sort of blanketty coat like you've got on? That wouldn't be an improvement, would it?"

"What is it, then?"

"Well, it's like this: All the water that runs down—you know how the water runs down a mackintosh, don't you? Well, all the water that runs down runs into a container, you see, a steel container; and that stops the drip, you see. It will be like a hem round the garment."

"I should think it would be rather stiff and heavy."

"Oh, no; you see it's only a very small container, and the steel will be quite pliable. I don't think you'd notice it at all. It would just look like an ornamental edging; it would be quite a neat finish to the garment."

"But won't it soon be full of water? What is to happen then?"

"Oh, that would be telling! You see, that's part of the invention. Well, I'll tell you that much. There'll be a cork, you see, and you'd pull it out now and then, just when you thought it was convenient, so as the water could run away. You see, there'll be a piece of the container just sticking out a bit, like an ornament, so as to give you a chance to let the water run off so it wouldn't run down you to wet you. You'd have a cork at each side at the bottom of your coat. One cork would be enough for each side. You'd just hold your arm out a bit when you were taking out the cork, you know, just take a little care, of course."

Frank Penman laughed.

Saunders eyed him indignantly and turned again to Miss Mayence:

"You can see how useful it would be for people who have to be out in all weathers. Canvassers and postmen and policemen—policemen could have it on their capes, and cyclists could have it on theirs. You could have it on your hat and your trousers—your skirt, I should say, in your case—as well as your overcoat. You could have it on your umbrella, for that matter, to save all the drip down other people's necks on the top of a bus, for instance: it's a splendid idea."

Frank Penman laughed again.

Miss Mayence tried to speak gravely, but her eyes were twinkling:

"Would you be able to shut the umbrella?" she asked innocently.

"I should think it could be arranged," Saunders answered a little coldly, "by some sort of hinged contrivance, or else the container could be bent into shape; but the umbrella is not essential."

"You know when it is very heavy rain," Miss Mayence proceeded, "haven't you noticed how the rain nearly fills the gutters of the houses, although it is rushing away all the time—although it is not corked up at all? I should think your friend's container, if it is small enough not to be in the way, would have at least as much water to carry off, in proportion, as the gutters on the eaves. Wouldn't it be necessary to keep the corks out all the time in heavy rain?"

"Well, you could do that."

"Wouldn't it be funny to see the policeman on point duty with a nice little fountain pouring out from each side of his cape and another from his hat?" We should have to take care not to pass too near each other, shouldn't we?"

"Oh, there wouldn't be so much water as all that," Saunders answered tartly.

"Has your friend used his invention much?"

"Unfortunately, he can't afford to get it made up. He got estimates for making the container from several firms, but they all asked too much. You see, it has to be made of a strong and pliable steel. He's only been able to show the drawings: that's one reason why the waterproof makers haven't taken it up, of course. They've got no imagination, you see—can't realise the benefits of a thing till they've seen it in actual use, you know."

"What is the other reason?"

"Well, you see, the well to do, they don't go out in all weathers much—not in London, at least, and if they do, they go in their car, or they take a taxi; and as for the middle class, they get in a bus. The people who are out for hours at a stretch in all weathers, walking, I mean, they are mostly folks as has a job to afford any sort of clothes. Then there's the firemen and postmen. They don't buy their uniforms—the Government buys it, or the company buys it, and why should the Government or the company bother about any little novelties to add to the expense? You can depend upon it, if those people were to buy their own, and could spend a bit, you know, they'd be a big body of people that 'ud jump at a thing like this if they was only to get to hear of it—but there it is—it's

(Continued on page 7.)

ROSA LUXEMBURG'S LETTERS

Breslau, Jan. 14th, 1918.

My Dearest Sonitschka,—What a long time it is since I last wrote you! I'm sure it must be months ago. And now I don't even know whether you are in Berlin; but am hoping that these lines will reach you in time for your birthday. I asked Mathilde to send you a bunch of orchids from me, and now the poor girl is lying in hospital and will hardly be able to carry out my request. But you know how I am always with you in thought, and would like to see you quite overwhelmed with flowers on your birthday, with lilac, orchids, with irises, with sweet-smelling hyacinths, with everything that can be got. Perhaps next year * at least, I shall be allowed to bring along some flowers to you myself on this day, and go for a walk with you in the Botanic Gardens and across country. How grand that would be! To-day the temperature here is zero. But at the same time there is quite a mild spring breeze in the air, and up above between the milk-white clouds a bit of deep-blue sky is glimmering, and when you add to it the joyful chirpings of the sparrows you would almost think it was the end of March. I am already bucked up because spring is coming, for it is the one thing one never gets tired of as long as one lives, the one thing, on the contrary, one gets to know how to understand and value more with each year. Do you know, Sonitschka, that the beginning of spring in the organic world, in other words, the awakening of life, occurs now, at the beginning of January, and does not wait for the calendar spring. Whilst the calendar is telling us that winter is just beginning, we are astronomically at the shortest distance from the sun, and this has such a mysterious influence upon all living things that even in our northern hemisphere, with its mantle of winter snow, the vegetable and animal kingdoms awaken to life at the beginning of January, as though by a magician's wand. The buds now start to open out, and for many animals the breeding season has already commenced. I see that France observes that the outstanding scientific and literary productions of celebrated authors fall in the months of January and February. And the solstice is supposed to have an effect upon human beings: the critical moment comes shortly after Christmas, when it brings a new vitality to the body. You, too, Sonitschka, are one of those early blooms that spring up amidst snow and ice, and that is why you feel life to be a bit chilly, never feel indigenous, and need a careful hot-house cultivation.

The Rodin you sent me at Christmas delighted me immensely, and I would have thanked you there and then, had Mathilde not told me that you were in Frankfurt. What appealed to me most of all is Rodin's love of nature, his adoration of every blade of grass in the fields. His must have been a splendid soul: sincere, natural, abounding in spiritual warmth and intelligence; he straight away reminds me of Jaurès. Did you like the Broedcooren I sent you? Or had you already read it? I took a great liking to this novel; the descriptions of the scenery in it are full of poetic power. One gets the impression from Broedcooren, just as one does from de Coster, that "over the land of Flanders" the sun rises and sets in greater glory than it does over the other parts of the earth. I find that the Flemings are all actually in love with their little country; they don't consider it a fair corner of the earth, but as a radiant young bride. And in the gloom of the tragic end I find a colour relationship with the grandiose pictures in Till Eulenspiegel, for instance, with the demolition of the public building. Don't you find that in these books there is a colour

* The following year, on January 15th, 1919, Rosa Luxemburg, together with Karl Liebknecht, was murdered by an organisation working under the protection of the Government for the restoration of the old regime.

scheme that at once reminds one of Rembrandt: the total dimness of the pictures, but scintillating with an old-gold tone; the most disconcerting realism of all the details and yet the ensemble set forth in a fictitious realm of fantasy.

I read in the "Berliner Tageblatt" that a big new Titian is hanging in the Friedrich Museum. Have you been to see it yet? I admit that I do not altogether care for Titian, I find him too spick and span and frigid, too much of a virtuoso—excuse me, perhaps that's mere majesty, but that is the direct impression he gives me. Nevertheless, I would be delighted to be able to go to the Friedrich Museum to view the new guest. Have you also seen the Kaufmann legacy, about which there has been so much ado?

I am now reading several old works on Shakespeare that came out in the 60's and 70's, when the Shakespeare problem was being so hotly contested in Germany. Can you get me from the Kgl. Bibliothek or from the Reichstagsbibliothek: Klein, History of Italian Drama; Schack, History of Dramatic Literature in Spain; Gervinus and Ulrici on Shakespeare? What's your standpoint with regard to Shakespeare? Write soon! Fond embrace and a hearty handshake. Keep calm and in good spirits in spite of all. Au revoir, dearest Sonitschka.

Sonjuschka, will you do me a great favour—send Mathilde J. some hyacinths in my name? I'll settle up for it when you come to see me.

Your ROSA.

ON THE RAND.

The case of "Taffy" Long, who was convicted of murder, is said to have established a record in the South African Courts. There were two trials—the first lasting eight days, the second twelve; and then there was an appeal. Altogether the case was handled by eleven judges, and there were over a hundred witnesses. It is estimated that the expenses of the case amount to approximately £7,000. The witnesses included men and women, soldiers and police, detectives and private persons. The first Court failed to come to a unanimous verdict, and the second Court was unanimous in its verdict of guilty, while the point that was reserved for the decision of the Appellate Court, regarding the precise jurisdiction of the Special Criminal Court here, was decided in favour of the Crown.

Our comrades "Taff" Long, Henry Hull, and Dave Lewis, strikers who had been convicted and sentenced to death by the Special Treason Court, were executed in the Central Prison, Pretoria. Their bodies were handed over to the relatives, and were buried in Johannesburg in Brixton Cemetery, under the auspices of the Industrial Federation.

Immediately the three martyrs were taken out of the condemned cell they started to sing the "Red Flag," and kept singing until silenced for ever by the executioner's rope.

All the prisoners in the cells, whether strikers or not, took up the Socialist hymn, and the singing surged throughout the prison. Cheer after cheer was given for the three martyrs of Capitalist hatred, and curses for those who, in their rage and terror, were murdering them. The Capitalist Press mentioned that the last words of Taffy Long were: "Are we downhearted?" and that an answering shout of "No!" rose from the throats of six hundred prisoners.

All prisoners were kept strictly in the cells while the execution was taking place.

People flocked in thousands to pay their last respects to the three victims.

Behind the hearse was a large contingent of returned soldiers, the mechanics' Unions, the tramway men's Union. The Communist banners came next, being carried in front of 2,000 to 2,500 Communists. After these were many women, representing different organisations, and representatives of every Union. Crowds of spectators lined the streets, being in some instances eight, nine and ten deep.

All bared their heads as the cortege went by. The police were absent during the procession.

It is estimated that there were 60,000 persons present at the cemetery. The bearers and mourners had the greatest difficulty in making their way to the graveside. For over an hour the huge crowds remained round the grave, almost unable to move. Those who had dropped flowers or earth upon it, and wished to leave, were pushed back by those who were trying to approach. There were thousands of wreaths from trades unions, relatives, friends, and sympathisers.

That day will live in our memories for a long time, and so will the memory of those of the bravest men we have ever known. Their names will live in history for centuries. No greater love has a man for his fellow-men than in giving his life for a cause which he justly believed to be right.

At an open-air meeting held at the Town Hall steps, the crowd numbering well over 6,000 men and women, pledged itself in the following terms:

"This vast meeting of Johannesburg citizens assembled, upon the eve of the judicial murders of Comrades Long, Hull, and Lewis, hereby solemnly pledges itself to renew forthwith and carry on to the bitter end the fight for industrial freedom, for which our Comrades Spendiff, Fisher, Stassen, Long, Hull, Lewis, and others unnamed, have made, and are making the supreme sacrifice."

This was carried enthusiastically by a show of both hands, with the great old song:

"With heads uncovered swore they all
To bear it onward till they fall.
'Spite dungeons dark and gallows grim,
They proudly sang the workers' hymn."
The Committee is issuing an appeal for the widows and children of the executed men.

ISAAC VERMONT.

BLOOD MONEY.

The Johannesburg Consolidated Investment Company, Ltd., which owns coal, gold, and diamond mines on the Rand, in spite of the depressed conditions which forced (!) it to lock out the miners, has paid a dividend of 7 per cent., tax free, and placed a substantial balance to reserve.

SPICE.

Lloyd George "a poor man" on Carnegie's £2,000 a year—and does he get a pension as ex-Premier also? Who said Marconis?

Sir Eric Geddes, of the Axe, starves on £11,000 a year pension, with a little extra dole of £15,000 this year.

After the fall of War Premier Lloyd George, the fall of War Premier Hughes of Australia. The Australian Labour Party, with thirty seats, is the largest Party in the Parliament; but other parties have between them forty-five seats. Will Australian Labour enter a Coalition?

Do not worry: the Australian Labour Party has proved its futility by a long spell of office. The Australian Soviets are due some time.

* * *
The "Daily Herald" is busy making a hero of the new Assistant Commissioner of Police, because he rose from the ranks and is, as the "Herald" says, "a real policeman."

Mr. Olive, just like Sir William Horwood, is an obedient servant of the "Haves," and will do his best to protect them and their property from the "Have Nots."

Please don't be silly!

* * *
Rather amusing that Mr. Walton Newbold, M.P., whom Labour Party discipline excludes from the Labour Party, should be accusing his Scottish colleagues who are in the Labour Party of failure to observe Labour Party discipline, when they refuse to be silenced by Labour Party reactionaries.

Workers' Dreadnought

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor, Business Communications to the Manager.

"Workers' Dreadnought," 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

Telephone: Central 7240.

SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Three Months (13 weeks) ... Post Free 1/7
Six Months (26 weeks) ... " 3/3
One Year (52 weeks) ... " 6/6

Vol. IX. No. 43. Saturday, Jan. 6, 1923.

Our View.

THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY ONE'S PEERS,

which is supposed to belong to every British subject, is a very shadowy one, for juries are bullied and argued into giving the verdict the Bench desires, and it rests with the Judge to pronounce sentence. Behind the Judge is the Home Office, which can overturn the decision of both Judge and jury. It constantly happens in murder trials that the jurymen who pronounce a verdict of guilty do not consider death the appropriate penalty for the crime. They express their opinion to the Judge, who assures them that according to the evidence they must declare the prisoner guilty, and bids them leave the question of mercy to a Government official who has not been present at the trial. In cases of theft and other minor crimes the jury is often opposed to the sentence given by the Judge; but the jury has no power over the Judge's decision.

When Fascismo, or something like it, gets a grip on this country, we shall see to what lengths the injustice of penal administration can be carried.

In this connection we ask readers to keep in touch with the doings of the New Crusaders.

THE KU KLUX KLAN is attempting to set itself up in Britain; in fact, quite a number of organisations are now competing in the effort to set up a body of White Terrorist bullies here: the Fascisti, the Ku Klux Klan, the British Legion, the Crusaders. The Ku Klux Klan at present declares that its object is to maintain the supremacy of the white races over the coloured; but in America it has directed its violence against Pacifists, Communists, the I.W.W., Trade Unionists, and any who are working towards progress.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON was a member of the Royal Commission appointed in order to rehabilitate the importance of the Honours handle to the name. The Commission majority of the Commissioners recommend that the Prime Minister should send the names of the persons he proposes to honour to a committee of three members of the Privy Council chosen by himself. Should this committee disagree with him, he would still have his way; but the report of the committee would be sent to the King, along with the Prime Minister's recommendation. Mr. Arthur Henderson dissents from the rest of the Commission; he proposes, not that honours and titles should henceforth disappear—no; cautious Mr. Henderson does not go so far as that—he merely suggests that political honours should be abolished.

MR. WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBER-

LAIN writes in the New York "Freeman," as a protagonist of the newest land law of Soviet Russia and the agricultural policy of the Lenin Government. He makes the following strange assertions:

"The 'Mir,' or village land society, has been the curse of Russian agriculture for generations; and under the new land law the right given to the individual peasant to withdraw from the society, taking with him his pro rata share of land, is an important step in the Soviet Government's campaign to eliminate the fundamental cause of famine by raising agricultural productivity. The great majority of the Russian peasants live, not in farmhouses, but in villages; and this doubtless explains the origin and persistence of the 'Mir.' This land society, including practically all the peasants in a village, apportions the village land, re-divides it at stated intervals, decides what crops should be planted, and exercises other regulating powers over the working habits of its members. . . . By re-dividing the land it took away from the peasant any incentive to undertake any kind of permanent improvement. Moreover, in an effort to secure economic equality of division, the village land is often split up into most minute fragments, each peasant receiving a few patches of good land and a few patches of bad. . . . The Government carries on its struggle with the backward tendencies of the Mir in two ways: First, it encourages the peasant to leave these societies. As an official in the Commissariat for Agriculture said to me: 'We constantly tell the peasant: Leave the 'Mir.' Take one step forward and become an individualist farmer. Or, if you want to take two steps forward, join an Agricultural Commune.' At the same time, in districts where the peasants still wish to keep the 'Mir,' the Government does everything in its power to make these societies more efficient and productive. It has already been successful in persuading some of the societies to substitute rotation of crops for the three-field system."

Mr. Chamberlain further says: "The Government is encouraging by every means in its power the development of large-scale industry in Russia. Last summer a group of Americans, mostly Non-Partisan League farmers, came to Russia with a supply of tractors and modern planting machinery, and took over a forty thousand acre farm in the province of Perm. The success of the experiment was remarkable . . . the peasants in the neighbourhood gazed with wonder and envy at the strange machines, which did more work in a day than a peasant with his horse and plough could hope to do in a whole season. Here are further points from Mr. Chamberlain's statement of law and policy:

"In the first place, the peasants seized almost all the land which formerly belonged to the Czar, and to the Church, and to the large land-owners. The State saved a few large estates for large farms for itself, and organised some agricultural communes; but 96 per cent. of the land in Russia is now being worked on an individualistic basis. . . . The earlier land laws of the Soviet Republic were primarily designed to facilitate the confiscation of the large estates and to limit the amount of land which any individual peasant might own. . . . Now it is recognised that the destructive period of the revolution is over, and that the new class of peasant proprietors which has arisen must be guaranteed reasonable security of tenure, if agricultural production is to be stimulated. . . . the Government has become somewhat more lenient in its regulations about the leasing of labour. . . . A man who lacks farm implements or draft animals may lease his piece of land

to some more fortunate peasant who will till it for him. . . . If the peasant who temporarily surrenders his land cannot rehabilitate himself within eight years . . . the land . . . reverts to the village community. . . . Labour also can be leased, in the few cases in which a peasant has more land than he can cultivate himself, with the aid of his family. In such cases the agricultural workers come under the full protection of the Government code of labour laws, with its basic eight-hour day."

This means that efforts are being made to extinguish the Mir, the ancient Communal and partially Communist organisation of the Russian peasants, and to replace it by individualist farming as the first and more general step. The second step, according to Mr. Chamberlain's Soviet official, is the "agricultural commune." On what basis the agricultural commune is to be organised Mr. Chamberlain does not explain; but he says, and the Soviet Government's own reports bear out his statement, that very few agricultural communes exist in Soviet Russia.

CZARS HAVE ATTEMPTED TO ABOLISH THE MIR, and now the Soviet Government also attacks it! The Czars fought the Mir because the unity achieved by the Mir was the sole means by which the peasants fought the Czarism. Says William English Walling, in "Russia's Message," published in 1908, as the result of several years of study:

"The Czars have always been able to exact from the peasants a terrible tribute of taxes and recruits. They have been able to tie the peasants to their villages and to prevent their escape from these exactions, but when they have attempted to interfere with the villagers' internal affairs, the imperial will has been shattered against the people's own ideas of right and wrong. Especially when they have tried to upset the people's own laws of property, it has been the autocrats who have had to surrender. The peasants as a whole have not yet permitted the Czars to subvert their laws of inheritance or their equitable system of distributing the land. . . . The hundred thousand villages where the mass of the Russian people live are in their internal affairs so many little immortal republics. At the present moment, as at the earliest dawn of history, they are ruled by a pure spirit of democracy, not only in political, but in economic affairs. A large part of the peasant land is village property, used by all the villagers in common; the rest is divided, and from time to time redistributed, according to the ideas of equity of the whole village. An estimate is made of each family's claims, either at the death of its head or at the time of a general census, and the family is allotted a certain proportion of the village ploughed land. But no person is ever allowed to claim a right to a particular piece of soil, he has merely a right to a certain quantity. There is no such thing as title and private ownership of the land itself. A family is allowed possession of a definite piece of the land long enough only to secure the family the fruits of its labour—that is, for three years' rotation of crops which prevails—then triennial redistribution of land takes place. . . . All the peasants live in the village and are infinitely more intimately related to one another than a country-people living on isolated farms. They work together, and are always under one another's eye. The spirit is profoundly social, and has been made all the more so by the village ownership of the land. The democracy rests on the feeling of full social and economic equality. . . . The village meetings concern themselves chiefly with . . . the winning of the daily bread. And so the equality of these tens of thousands of little communities has gone deeper than any other equality we know. . . .

THE real business of the village is concentrated in the assembly itself, and there are few villages that do not take an active part. There is nothing more immediate or important in their lives. . . . In some cases there is already complete Communism—that is, both common ownership and common cultivation of the soil, a system that allows the advantage not only of every modern method of agriculture, but of large-scale production and the use of machinery that no small farmer can afford. Peasant companies (artels) often buy or rent a piece of land, work it together, and share expenses and profits according to a pre-arranged plan. In all villages the peasants manage their cattle in common, and in many cases they own a common granary."

The so-called Stolypin "reform" already being prepared whilst Walling wrote, gave the peasant the right to sell his land, and thus facilitated the growth, both of a minority of richer peasants and of the landless labourers, who, having sold their right to use the land in a moment of hardship, are thereafter compelled to be the wage-servants of others. The revolution of 1917 attempted both to wipe out the "reform" of Stolypin and to divide up the estates of the great landlords amongst the peasants, restoring the customs of the Mir, and giving every peasant access to the land. Many of us remember the testimony of Dr. Rickman, who had lived long in Russia, and who declared that the peasants supported the Bolsheviks because they believed the Bolsheviks were reviving "old Russian ideas."

NOW the Soviet Government is following in the footsteps of Stolypin. As the Vandalism of Pseudo Marxists. . . . The new class of peasant proprietors must be guaranteed security of tenure, if agricultural production is to be stimulated. . . . the Government has become somewhat more lenient in its regulations about the leasing of labour. . . . A man who lacks farm implements or draft animals may lease his piece of land

to some more fortunate peasant who will till it for him. . . . If the peasant who temporarily surrenders his land cannot rehabilitate himself within eight years . . . the land . . . reverts to the village community. . . . Labour also can be leased, in the few cases in which a peasant has more land than he can cultivate himself, with the aid of his family. In such cases the agricultural workers come under the full protection of the Government code of labour laws, with its basic eight-hour day."

This means that efforts are being made to extinguish the Mir, the ancient Communal and partially Communist organisation of the Russian peasants, and to replace it by individualist farming as the first and more general step. The second step, according to Mr. Chamberlain's Soviet official, is the "agricultural commune." On what basis the agricultural commune is to be organised Mr. Chamberlain does not explain; but he says, and the Soviet Government's own reports bear out his statement, that very few agricultural communes exist in Soviet Russia.

CZARS HAVE ATTEMPTED TO ABOLISH THE MIR, and now the Soviet Government also attacks it! The Czars fought the Mir because the unity achieved by the Mir was the sole means by which the peasants fought the Czarism. Says William English Walling, in "Russia's Message," published in 1908, as the result of several years of study:

"The Czars have always been able to exact from the peasants a terrible tribute of taxes and recruits. They have been able to tie the peasants to their villages and to prevent their escape from these exactions, but when they have attempted to interfere with the villagers' internal affairs, the imperial will has been shattered against the people's own ideas of right and wrong. Especially when they have tried to upset the people's own laws of property, it has been the autocrats who have had to surrender. The peasants as a whole have not yet permitted the Czars to subvert their laws of inheritance or their equitable system of distributing the land. . . . The hundred thousand villages where the mass of the Russian people live are in their internal affairs so many little immortal republics. At the present moment, as at the earliest dawn of history, they are ruled by a pure spirit of democracy, not only in political, but in economic affairs. A large part of the peasant land is village property, used by all the villagers in common; the rest is divided, and from time to time redistributed, according to the ideas of equity of the whole village. An estimate is made of each family's claims, either at the death of its head or at the time of a general census, and the family is allotted a certain proportion of the village ploughed land. But no person is ever allowed to claim a right to a particular piece of soil, he has merely a right to a certain quantity. There is no such thing as title and private ownership of the land itself. A family is allowed possession of a definite piece of the land long enough only to secure the family the fruits of its labour—that is, for three years' rotation of crops which prevails—then triennial redistribution of land takes place. . . . All the peasants live in the village and are infinitely more intimately related to one another than a country-people living on isolated farms. They work together, and are always under one another's eye. The spirit is profoundly social, and has been made all the more so by the village ownership of the land. The democracy rests on the feeling of full social and economic equality. . . . The village meetings concern themselves chiefly with . . . the winning of the daily bread. And so the equality of these tens of thousands of little communities has gone deeper than any other equality we know. . . .

THE real business of the village is concentrated in the assembly itself, and there are few villages that do not take an active part. There is nothing more immediate or important in their lives. . . . In some cases there is already complete Communism—that is, both common ownership and common cultivation of the soil, a system that allows the advantage not only of every modern method of agriculture, but of large-scale production and the use of machinery that no small farmer can afford. Peasant companies (artels) often buy or rent a piece of land, work it together, and share expenses and profits according to a pre-arranged plan. In all villages the peasants manage their cattle in common, and in many cases they own a common granary."

The so-called Stolypin "reform" already being prepared whilst Walling wrote, gave the peasant the right to sell his land, and thus facilitated the growth, both of a minority of richer peasants and of the landless labourers, who, having sold their right to use the land in a moment of hardship, are thereafter compelled to be the wage-servants of others. The revolution of 1917 attempted both to wipe out the "reform" of Stolypin and to divide up the estates of the great landlords amongst the peasants, restoring the customs of the Mir, and giving every peasant access to the land. Many of us remember the testimony of Dr. Rickman, who had lived long in Russia, and who declared that the peasants supported the Bolsheviks because they believed the Bolsheviks were reviving "old Russian ideas."

NOW the Soviet Government is following in the footsteps of Stolypin. As the Vandalism of Pseudo Marxists. . . . The new class of peasant proprietors must be guaranteed security of tenure, if agricultural production is to be stimulated. . . . the Government has become somewhat more lenient in its regulations about the leasing of labour. . . . A man who lacks farm implements or draft animals may lease his piece of land

to some more fortunate peasant who will till it for him. . . . If the peasant who temporarily surrenders his land cannot rehabilitate himself within eight years . . . the land . . . reverts to the village community. . . . Labour also can be leased, in the few cases in which a peasant has more land than he can cultivate himself, with the aid of his family. In such cases the agricultural workers come under the full protection of the Government code of labour laws, with its basic eight-hour day."

This means that efforts are being made to extinguish the Mir, the ancient Communal and partially Communist organisation of the Russian peasants, and to replace it by individualist farming as the first and more general step. The second step, according to Mr. Chamberlain's Soviet official, is the "agricultural commune." On what basis the agricultural commune is to be organised Mr. Chamberlain does not explain; but he says, and the Soviet Government's own reports bear out his statement, that very few agricultural communes exist in Soviet Russia.

CZARS HAVE ATTEMPTED TO ABOLISH THE MIR, and now the Soviet Government also attacks it! The Czars fought the Mir because the unity achieved by the Mir was the sole means by which the peasants fought the Czarism. Says William English Walling, in "Russia's Message," published in 1908, as the result of several years of study:

"The Czars have always been able to exact from the peasants a terrible tribute of taxes and recruits. They have been able to tie the peasants to their villages and to prevent their escape from these exactions, but when they have attempted to interfere with the villagers' internal affairs, the imperial will has been shattered against the people's own ideas of right and wrong. Especially when they have tried to upset the people's own laws of property, it has been the autocrats who have had to surrender. The peasants as a whole have not yet permitted the Czars to subvert their laws of inheritance or their equitable system of distributing the land. . . . The hundred thousand villages where the mass of the Russian people live are in their internal affairs so many little immortal republics. At the present moment, as at the earliest dawn of history, they are ruled by a pure spirit of democracy, not only in political, but in economic affairs. A large part of the peasant land is village property, used by all the villagers in common; the rest is divided, and from time to time redistributed, according to the ideas of equity of the whole village. An estimate is made of each family's claims, either at the death of its head or at the time of a general census, and the family is allotted a certain proportion of the village ploughed land. But no person is ever allowed to claim a right to a particular piece of soil, he has merely a right to a certain quantity. There is no such thing as title and private ownership of the land itself. A family is allowed possession of a definite piece of the land long enough only to secure the family the fruits of its labour—that is, for three years' rotation of crops which prevails—then triennial redistribution of land takes place. . . . All the peasants live in the village and are infinitely more intimately related to one another than a country-people living on isolated farms. They work together, and are always under one another's eye. The spirit is profoundly social, and has been made all the more so by the village ownership of the land. The democracy rests on the feeling of full social and economic equality. . . . The village meetings concern themselves chiefly with . . . the winning of the daily bread. And so the equality of these tens of thousands of little communities has gone deeper than any other equality we know. . . .

THE real business of the village is concentrated in the assembly itself, and there are few villages that do not take an active part. There is nothing more immediate or important in their lives. . . . In some cases there is already complete Communism—that is, both common ownership and common cultivation of the soil, a system that allows the advantage not only of every modern method of agriculture, but of large-scale production and the use of machinery that no small farmer can afford. Peasant companies (artels) often buy or rent a piece of land, work it together, and share expenses and profits according to a pre-arranged plan. In all villages the peasants manage their cattle in common, and in many cases they own a common granary."

The so-called Stolypin "reform" already being prepared whilst Walling wrote, gave the peasant the right to sell his land, and thus facilitated the growth, both of a minority of richer peasants and of the landless labourers, who, having sold their right to use the land in a moment of hardship, are thereafter compelled to be the wage-servants of others. The revolution of 1917 attempted both to wipe out the "reform" of Stolypin and to divide up the estates of the great landlords amongst the peasants, restoring the customs of the Mir, and giving every peasant access to the land. Many of us remember the testimony of Dr. Rickman, who had lived long in Russia, and who declared that the peasants supported the Bolsheviks because they believed the Bolsheviks were reviving "old Russian ideas."

NOW the Soviet Government is following in the footsteps of Stolypin. As the Vandalism of Pseudo Marxists. . . . The new class of peasant proprietors must be guaranteed security of tenure, if agricultural production is to be stimulated. . . . the Government has become somewhat more lenient in its regulations about the leasing of labour. . . . A man who lacks farm implements or draft animals may lease his piece of land

"The real business of the village is concentrated in the assembly itself, and there are few villages that do not take an active part. There is nothing more immediate or important in their lives. . . . In some cases there is already complete Communism—that is, both common ownership and common cultivation of the soil, a system that allows the advantage not only of every modern method of agriculture, but of large-scale production and the use of machinery that no small farmer can afford. Peasant companies (artels) often buy or rent a piece of land, work it together, and share expenses and profits according to a pre-arranged plan. In all villages the peasants manage their cattle in common, and in many cases they own a common granary."

The so-called Stolypin "reform" already being prepared whilst Walling wrote, gave the peasant the right to sell his land, and thus facilitated the growth, both of a minority of richer peasants and of the landless labourers, who, having sold their right to use the land in a moment of hardship, are thereafter compelled to be the wage-servants of others. The revolution of 1917 attempted both to wipe out the "reform" of Stolypin and to divide up the estates of the great landlords amongst the peasants, restoring the customs of the Mir, and giving every peasant access to the land. Many of us remember the testimony of Dr. Rickman, who had lived long in Russia, and who declared that the peasants supported the Bolsheviks because they believed the Bolsheviks were reviving "old Russian ideas."

NOW the Soviet Government is following in the footsteps of Stolypin. As the Vandalism of Pseudo Marxists. . . . The new class of peasant proprietors must be guaranteed security of tenure, if agricultural production is to be stimulated. . . . the Government has become somewhat more lenient in its regulations about the leasing of labour. . . . A man who lacks farm implements or draft animals may lease his piece of land

to some more fortunate peasant who will till it for him. . . . If the peasant who temporarily surrenders his land cannot rehabilitate himself within eight years . . . the land . . . reverts to the village community. . . . Labour also can be leased, in the few cases in which a peasant has more land than he can cultivate himself, with the aid of his family. In such cases the agricultural workers come under the full protection of the Government code of labour laws, with its basic eight-hour day."

This means that efforts are being made to extinguish the Mir, the ancient Communal and partially Communist organisation of the Russian peasants, and to replace it by individualist farming as the first and more general step. The second step, according to Mr. Chamberlain's Soviet official, is the "agricultural commune." On what basis the agricultural commune is to be organised Mr. Chamberlain does not explain; but he says, and the Soviet Government's own reports bear out his statement, that very few agricultural communes exist in Soviet Russia.

CZARS HAVE ATTEMPTED TO ABOLISH THE MIR, and now the Soviet Government also attacks it! The Czars fought the Mir because the unity achieved by the Mir was the sole means by which the peasants fought the Czarism. Says William English Walling, in "Russia's Message," published in 1908, as the result of several years of study:

"The Czars have always been able to exact from the peasants a terrible tribute of taxes and recruits. They have been able to tie the peasants to their villages and to prevent their escape from these exactions, but when they have attempted to interfere with the villagers' internal affairs, the imperial will has been shattered against the people's own ideas of right and wrong. Especially when they have tried to upset the people's own laws of property, it has been the autocrats who have had to surrender. The peasants as a whole have not yet permitted the Czars to subvert their laws of inheritance or their equitable system of distributing the land. . . . The hundred thousand villages where the mass of the Russian people live are in their internal affairs so many little immortal republics. At the present moment, as at the earliest dawn of history, they are ruled by a pure spirit of democracy, not only in political, but in economic affairs. A large part of the peasant land is village property, used by all the villagers in common; the rest is divided, and from time to time redistributed, according to the ideas of equity of the whole village. An estimate is made of each family's claims, either at the death of its head or at the time of a general census, and the family is allotted a certain proportion of the village ploughed land. But no person is ever allowed to claim a right to a particular piece of soil, he has merely a right to a certain quantity. There is no such thing as title and private ownership of the land itself. A family is allowed possession of a definite piece of the land long enough only to secure the family the fruits of its labour—that is, for three years' rotation of crops which prevails—then triennial redistribution of land takes place. . . . All the peasants live in the village and are infinitely more intimately related to one another than a country-people living on isolated farms. They work together, and are always under one another's eye. The spirit is profoundly social, and has been made all the more so by the village ownership of the land. The democracy rests on the feeling of full social and economic equality. . . . The village meetings concern themselves chiefly with . . . the winning of the daily bread. And so the equality of these tens of thousands of little communities has gone deeper than any other equality we know. . . .

THE real business of the village is concentrated in the assembly itself, and there are few villages that do not take an active part. There is nothing more immediate or important in their lives. . . . In some cases there is already complete Communism—that is, both common ownership and common cultivation of the soil, a system that allows the advantage not only of every modern method of agriculture, but of large-scale production and the use of machinery that no small farmer can afford. Peasant companies (artels) often buy or rent a piece of land, work it together, and share expenses and profits according to a pre-arranged plan. In all villages the peasants manage their cattle in common, and in many cases they own a common granary."

The so-called Stolypin "reform" already being prepared whilst Walling wrote, gave the peasant the right to sell his land, and thus facilitated the growth, both of a minority of richer peasants and of the landless labourers, who, having sold their right to use the land in a moment of hardship, are thereafter compelled to be the wage-servants of others. The revolution of 1917 attempted both to wipe out the "reform" of Stolypin and to divide up the estates of the great landlords amongst the peasants, restoring the customs of the Mir, and giving every peasant access to the land. Many of us remember the testimony of Dr. Rickman, who had lived long in Russia, and who declared that the peasants supported the Bolsheviks because they believed the Bolsheviks were reviving "old Russian ideas."

NOW the Soviet Government is following in the footsteps of Stolypin. As the Vandalism of Pseudo Marxists. . . . The new class of peasant proprietors must be guaranteed security of tenure, if agricultural production is to be stimulated. . . . the Government has become somewhat more lenient in its regulations about the leasing of labour. . . . A man who lacks farm implements or draft animals may lease his piece of land

to some more fortunate peasant who will till it for him. . . . If the peasant who temporarily surrenders his land cannot rehabilitate himself within eight years . . . the land . . . reverts to the village community. . . . Labour also can be leased, in the few cases in which a peasant has more land than he can cultivate himself, with the aid of his family. In such cases the agricultural workers come under the full protection of the Government code of labour laws, with its basic eight-hour day."

This means that efforts are being made to extinguish the Mir, the ancient Communal and partially Communist organisation of the Russian peasants, and to replace it by individualist farming as the first and more general step. The second step, according to Mr. Chamberlain's Soviet official, is the "agricultural commune." On what basis the agricultural commune is to be organised Mr. Chamberlain does not explain; but he says, and the Soviet Government's own reports bear out his statement, that very few agricultural communes exist in Soviet Russia.

create a condition essentially unfavourable to the coming of Communism.

The Russian Mir provided a field with many elements favourable to Communism not found elsewhere in the world to-day.

It is argued that the Mir is backward; but the peasants who form the Mir will not become enlightened merely because the Mir is destroyed. It is argued that in the Mir the land is cut up into small strips, and the backward three-field system of cultivation obtains.

The backwardness and poverty of the Mir is the backwardness and poverty of the peasants, who have been ground down and exploited by landlords and tax gatherers, and before and since the revolution, have only been able to procure primitive wooden instruments. Rents under the Czarism were often twice what the peasant land could produce; the peasant family made up the deficit by labour for the landlord or in the city. Taxes also were often twice what the land could produce: the tax collector appeared at harvest, and took every scrap of the peasants' property not necessary to prevent their immediate starvation. The balance was made up by work done by the family for others. The peasants found the price of petrol quadrupled by taxation, and their tea doubled. The wages of farm labourers were sometimes as low as 4½d. a day, and averaged only 8½d. In Saratov the average income of a peasant family was only £11 a year, more than half of which went in taxation.

Yet in their poverty and oppression the peasants' sense of solidarity was strong: the unmarried adults were distributed amongst the peasant households, and even when they could work no more, and whether relatives or the household or not, they were maintained as a matter of course. The wayfarer was sure of food and shelter from the villagers, even though penniless. Such customs are of the essence of Communism. When cupidity and private self-interest have ousted them, they will not be easy to restore.

Mr. Chamberlain tells of the Yankee farmers who have gone to Russia to teach the peasants the way. Well and good; let them go with their tractors, but do they hire the peasants as their wage-slaves?

Is the peasant to be urged to acquire more land as an individualist farmer in order that he may get a tractor and hire some of his late equals in the Mir to work for him? Or is the Mir to be urged to join its many individual strips of land and work them in common with the aid of the tractor?

It seems that the greatest service a Russian Communist can do at present is to settle down in some village and try to induce the peasants there to live the Communist life.

Let us hope that the Russian peasants will in the mass still refuse to become individualist farmers at the bidding of a Soviet Government, just as they refused at the bidding of a Czar.

THE RIGHT-WING COMMUNISTS appear to have changed places with the Fabian Society. The C.P.G.B. is now urging the miners to "raise an agitation for the adoption of the Sankey Report." This is what we should expect of Mr. Frank Hodges.

We observe that Mr. Walton Newbold, at the Manchester Free Trade Hall, said he was the first of a band of Reds which would find its way to the House of Commons and stay there "to do the final trick." What about the Soviets—are they forgotten?

AT LIVORNO the Fascisti knocked at the door of Alessandro Chiappa in the middle of the night demanding admittance in the name of the law. Chiappa was an old internationalist, and paralysed in both legs as a result of injuries received in the popular uprisings of 1898. The Fascisti had come seeking his nephew, but finding the young man absent they turned to the old Chiappa,

asking: "Where shall we shoot you?" Finally they shot him in the chest, leaving him to die after some hours of agony. This is how Mussolini's armed squads, now supposed to be for "national defence," carry on their work. Mussolini demands that all State officials be Fascisti. The "Daily Herald" mentions D'Annunzio as "the man most likely to lead a successful opposition to Mussolini." Strange that the "Herald" should look to a burlesque adventurer who intrigues with the pretender to the Italian throne rather than to the working-class movement.

POINCARÉ'S plan for settling the German reparations question, as we anticipated in these columns, is on the same lines as the agreement which the Allied Powers have come to in regard to Austria. Austria is put in pawn, and her affairs are controlled by a Commission of the lending Powers. Poincaré proposes to do the same thing, with slightly different details, as a condition of a two years' moratorium to Germany—a moratorium which, he it noted, excludes payments in kind, payments for the armies of occupation, clearing-house payments in respect of debts to Allied nationals, which will have to be paid just the same. On condition of the moratorium, Poincaré proposes Allied control over Germany's finances through a Committee of Guarantees stationed in Berlin; Allied exploitation of State forests in the Rhineland, and Customs in the Ruhr Valley through inter-Allied Commissions; the Reichsbank to cease the discounting of treasury bonds, the German Government to raise money by international loans in gold, and the Allies to collect the 26 per cent. export duty from the Rhineland and the Ruhr, and the coal tax of the Rhine and Ruhr.

The odd thing is that whilst the Labour Party supports the Austrian bargain (Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, declaring that the Allies must have control), and describing the measure as beneficent, the "Daily Herald" denounces Poincaré's similar proposals for Germany, and says: "No such system of economic vassalage has ever before been proposed for a modern civilised country."

How truly disastrous it is that the Labour Party should thus make common cause with the foreign policy of an Imperialist Tory Government!

THE TURKS declare that they will stand out on the Mosul oil and capitulations issues. So they will, as long as the French Government secretly reinforces them, and so it will until the British Government accepts Poincaré's plan. The Russian Soviet Government is disappointed, of course; it hoped to use Turkey as a buffer against the attacks of Western Powers through the Straits. The Turks used the aid of Soviet Russia, so long as it helped them; but they are in greater awe of the British Navy than of Russia's Red Army, and the Turkish Government has not scrupled to persecute Communists in Turkey, in spite of the zeal in nationalistic propaganda to which Soviet Russia instructed them.

SOVIET RUSSIA will soon be civilised enough for Capitalist Government. Russia Getting Civilised. A seaman returning from Archangel tells us that starving people flocked to the ship's side there crying for food, whilst, on landing, the seamen found that some people were living in a riot of luxury.

Kameney, speaking at the Pan-Russian Congress in Moscow, expressed approval of the agreement between the Soviet Government and the German firm of Wolff. He asserted that it is necessary to cement the Urquhart agreement. Several British firms are negotiating with the Soviet Government

asking: "Where shall we shoot you?" Finally they shot him in the chest, leaving him to die after some hours of agony. This is how Mussolini's armed squads, now supposed to be for "national defence," carry on their work. Mussolini demands that all State officials be Fascisti. The "Daily Herald" mentions D'Annunzio as "the man most likely to lead a successful opposition to Mussolini." Strange that the "Herald" should look to a burlesque adventurer who intrigues with the pretender to the Italian throne rather than to the working-class movement.

POINCARÉ'S plan for settling the German reparations question, as we anticipated in these columns, is on the same lines as the agreement which the Allied Powers have come to in regard to Austria. Austria is put in pawn, and her affairs are controlled by a Commission of the lending Powers. Poincaré proposes to do the same thing, with slightly different details, as a condition of a two years' moratorium to Germany—a moratorium which, he it noted, excludes payments in kind, payments for the armies of occupation, clearing-house payments in respect of debts to Allied nationals, which will have to be paid just the same. On condition of the moratorium, Poincaré proposes Allied control over Germany's finances through a Committee of Guarantees stationed in Berlin; Allied exploitation of State forests in the Rhineland, and Customs in the Ruhr Valley through inter-Allied Commissions; the Reichsbank to cease the discounting of treasury bonds, the German Government to raise money by international loans in gold, and the Allies to collect the 26 per cent. export duty from the Rhineland and the Ruhr, and the coal tax of the Rhine and Ruhr.

The odd thing is that whilst the Labour Party supports the Austrian bargain (Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, declaring that the Allies must have control), and describing the measure as beneficent, the "Daily Herald" denounces Poincaré's similar proposals for Germany, and says: "No such system of economic vassalage has ever before been proposed for a modern civilised country."

How truly disastrous it is that the Labour Party should thus make common cause with the foreign policy of an Imperialist Tory Government!

THE TURKS declare that they will stand out on the Mosul oil and capitulations issues. So they will, as long as the French Government secretly reinforces them, and so it will until the British Government accepts Poincaré's plan.

The Russian Soviet Government is disappointed, of course; it hoped to use Turkey as a buffer against the attacks of Western Powers through the Straits. The Turks used the aid of Soviet Russia, so long as it helped them; but they are in greater awe of the British Navy than of Russia's Red Army, and the Turkish Government has not scrupled to persecute Communists in Turkey, in spite of the zeal in nationalistic propaganda to which Soviet Russia instructed them.

SOVIET RUSSIA will soon be civilised enough for Capitalist Government. Russia Getting Civilised. A seaman returning from Archangel tells us that starving people flocked to the ship's side there crying for food, whilst, on landing, the seamen found that some people were living in a riot of luxury.

Kameney, speaking at the Pan-Russian Congress in Moscow, expressed approval of the agreement between the Soviet Government and the German firm of Wolff. He asserted that it is necessary to cement the Urquhart agreement. Several British firms are negotiating with the Soviet Government

for the return of their pre-revolutionary concessions.

The spirit of Communism weeps for her erring children.

THE LEECHES have already been put on to Austria. The first fruits of

First Fruits of the Austrian Loan Agreement are the Government's promise to make doles to the partially employed workers, and the reduction of the Austrian Government's contribution to the insurance benefit of the totally unemployed from one-third to 10 per cent.

Hitherto the Government has contributed one-third, the worker one-third, and the employer one-third; now the Government will contribute 10 per cent., and the local authority 10 per cent. These measures are, of course, dictated by the Commission set up by the Allied Powers, who will guarantee the loan. This is but the thin end of a very thick wedge which is bound to follow.

Those who supported the Austrian Loan proposal should give careful attention to the results which will emerge from it.

ESPERANTO.

LESSON 2.

A sentence expresses a complete thought.

If you say *ĉambro*, a room, that is, of course, not a complete thought in the sense intended; and it is still not complete if you say *granda ĉambro*, a big room.

The simplest type of sentence is formed with *ESTAS* (is, am, are); for example:

La ĉambro *estas* granda, the room *is* big.

La tablo *estas* alta, the table *is* high.

La piano *estas* bela, the piano *is* beautiful.

Vocabulary.

ruĝa	red	libro	a book
verda	green	flago	a flag
bona	good	bildo	a picture
alta	high	fajro	a fire
bela	beautiful	muro	a wall
brila	bright		

Translate: The flag is red; the book is green; the picture is beautiful; the book is good; the wall is high; the fire is bright.

The Plural.

Bildo, a picture; bildoj (pronounce * "bill-doy"), pictures; ĉambro, a room; ĉambroj (pronounce "ĉahm-broy"), rooms.

* Note that the accent or stress is **always** on the last syllable but one.

Bildo means a (one) picture; bildoj means pictures, that is, more than one picture.

In other words, bildoj, ĉambroj, are in the plural.

The plural number is always formed by adding *j* to the singular form.

Ruĝa rozo, a red rose; ruĝaj rozoj, red roses.

Aj is pronounced like "eye."

Oj "oy."

If a foreign Esperantist were to hear the English words *my boy*, he would represent in Esperanto the sounds he heard as *maj ooj*.

This would, of course, have no meaning in Esperanto.

Note that *j* is added not merely to the noun, but to the adjective also; thus, grandaj ĉambroj, big rooms; belaj floroj, beautiful flowers.

Grammatically, we should express this by saying that the adjective **agrees with the noun in number**.

The adjective must still be in the plural even if it is separated from its noun—e.g.:

La ĉambroj estas grandaj, the rooms are big; la libroj estas novaj, the books are new.

It would be well to practise all the words given in the preceding lesson with the adjective and noun in the plural form. It may take a minute to learn a rule; it takes many minutes' practice to form the habit of following the rule.

Translate: A red flag; the red flag; the flag is red; the flags are red; a green book; the books are green; the chairs (seĝoj) are high;

the pianos are beautiful; the fires are bright; the sofas are new; the pictures are beautiful. La ruĝa flago estas la emblemo de internacia Komunismo. La verda flago estas la emblemo de la internacia lingvo, Esperanto.

LA KOMUNISTA MANIFESTO.

Dauřiga.

La kapitalistaro, dum sia apenaŭ centjara regado, estas kreinta pli masivajn kaj pli kolosajn produktajn povojn ol kreis ĉiuj antaŭaj generacioj entute. Subjugado de la povoj de naturo al la homoj, maŝinaro, la aplikado de la ĥemio al la industrio kaj la terkulturo, vapora marveturado, la fervojoj, elektra telegrafo, la pretigado de tutaj kontinentoj al kulturado, kanalo de riveroj, tutaj logantaj elstarigitaĵoj el la tero—kiu antaŭa centjaro havis eĉ antaŭsenton ke tiaj produktaj povoj dormis en la patrino teno de la socia laboro?

Dauřigota.

WAS THE GREAT WAR DELIBERATELY PROLONGED?

In his book, "Where Iron is, there is the Fatherland," * Clarence K. Streit asserts that the Great War might have been promptly ended by the Allies, had they shelled the Briey iron region, which the Germans invaded immediately war broke out. It was not until 1918 that the Allies began an offensive against Briey. The American soldiers sent to that sector wondered at its tranquility, and were told by the French that there had not been a man killed there since war broke out. There was a little wine-shop between the German and Allied lines there in "No Man's Land." The Allies patronised it by day, the Germans by night. Mr. Streit, at Chaumont on April 14th, 1919, conversing with the American Brigadier-General Conner, chief of the section of the American General Staff, asked:

"Is it true that this district of Briey which the Germans held was so important to Germany for munitions that she could not have lasted six months had the Allies taken it?"

The answer was: "I don't know about the six months' limit, but the capture of it would have sounded the doom of Germany."

The French also were aware that Briey was important to Germany as a source of war material. The French "Bulletin des Armées," December 6th, 1916, published by the French Minister of War, said:

"The Basin of Briey appears to constitute for our enemies a precious reserve. It is, indeed, impossible not to be struck by the fact that the quantity of mineral imported by Germany from foreign countries before the war represents just about the amount which the Basin of Briey was then furnishing us."

The French Minister Loucheur admitted in the Chamber after the war that the French had taken 14,000,000 tons of ore from Briey during the war.

The Germans in many documents also testified to the importance of Briey to them.

The facts concerning Briey were made public in several French newspapers, and especially "L'Oeuvre," edited by Gustave Téry, but the censor presently intervened to prohibit comment upon the question.

War Prolonged to Protect Ironmasters' Property.

Mr. Streit marshals evidence to prove that Briey was not attacked because the iron capitalists did not desire it to be attacked. He also reminds us that Merrheim, the French Trade Union leader, opposed an allied attack on Briey, on the ground that the mineral production of Briey represented only a minimum part of Germany's needs, and that it would be difficult to re-take. Merrheim admitted that he induced a friend of his, named Hoeschler, to write a series of articles in

* Published by Huebsch, New York. May be obtained from the "Dreadnought" Book-shop, price 2/6.

"Le Temps" to this effect. It is known that the French Socialist (!) Cachin was hired by the French Government to make propaganda to induce Italy to join the Allies, and that the Italian Socialist (!) Mussolini was bought by the French Government for the same purpose—but what of Merrheim?

The Socialist deputy Barthe, who carried on a campaign regarding the refusal to attack Briey, declared in the Chamber that a General had been officially reprimanded for bombarding Briey by aeroplanes, and that during one period of the war the military chiefs forbade the aviators to bomb Briey. Deputy Flandin, a Conservative, who had served at the front, declared that the soldiers there often wondered why the mines and smelting plants, which the Germans were operating at Briey, were not attacked. He had gone himself to the headquarters of General Guillaumet, who was in command of the Second Army, and had given him a detailed plan of the Briey mines and smelting works. A bombardment of mines at Joetz then took place, but no other bombardments followed. Why? One obvious reason presented itself: The mines at Joetz belonged to Deputy Francois de Wendel, and de Wendel was president of the French Committee of Forges, the iron and steel combine, which, through its "Comptoir" organisation, has a virtual monopoly of the iron and steel business of France. The Combine, by the way, had 252 members when war broke out, and employed 200,000 workmen. This Combine was linked with the war material and armour plate trusts, the syndicate of railway material producers, the syndicate of hydraulic power plants. The Union of Metallurgical and Mining Industries united all these. These are a powerful force; a force with power to make and unmake Governments—a force which regards the preservation of its profits as the test of patriotism. A member of the French Parliament, Fernand Engerand, a Conservative, told the Chamber, on February 1st, 1919, that in February 1915 he learnt the facts about the Briey situation. He wrote of it in the Press, he called the attention of a member of the French Academy to it. Nothing happened. Three times he wrote to the Army General Staff; but he learnt that the staff officer who received his communications was an ironmaster. The staff officer, as an ironmaster, did not desire that the district should be attacked. Men, women and children might be killed, homes might be wrecked, but the plant of the ironmasters must be preserved.

When in 1917 the aeroplane bombing of Briey was finally supposed to have begun, the business was given into the hands of Lieutenant Lejeune, an employee of the Committee of Forges.

Economic Malthusianism.

Mr. Streit points out firstly, that though France had iron in the East and West, in the Pyrenees, and in Normandy, the mineral production and the metallurgical industries were concentrated on the Lorraine frontier, and were thus certain to be attacked in the expected war with Germany. One reason of this concentration was that France was poor in coal, though rich in iron; and the iron and steel works on the German frontier could easily get coal from Germany, and thus produce more cheaply than if situated in other parts of France. Another reason is that the French iron and steel manufacturers are economic malthusians: they desire to keep up prices by limiting production. The French steel trust was not altogether delighted by the annexation of the Alsace-Lorraine and the Sarre coal basin. M. Pinot, its secretary, said in 1915 that this annexation would be serious for the French Trust because it would increase the French production of steel; the fact being that sheltered behind the French tariff wall the steel Trust could keep French steel prices very high, provided it did not produce too much. To safeguard its prices, the steel Trust is now agitating for a tariff wall between Alsace-Lorraine and the rest of France.

As has been observed above, the iron and steel Trust was closely connected with the hydro-electric Trust; they had the same general secretary, M. Robert Pinot. The hydro-electric Trust had also its non-patriotic tendencies. The hydro-electric Trust in February 1912 contracted to supply a "war stock" of ferro-silicon to the German firm of Krupps, since Germany had not enough ferro-silicon for its war industries, and would need large supplies, because war with France was expected about 1914. During 1912 and 1913 6,000 tons of ferro-silicon, sufficient to treat 600,000 tons of steel, were delivered to Krupps. A Frenchman, M. Riva-Berni,

M. Millerand, who has been appointed Governor-General of Alsace-Lorraine, is the legal adviser of the Committee of Forges, and will work for the Trust in this respect as in others.

Pacifist Methods of the Steel Trust.

Mr. Streit further shows that the iron and steel industry, though concentrated on the German frontier, was not protected by fortifications. Nancy was fortified, but not Briey, where the mines and factories were. Moreover, Briey was not defended. Briey was outside the zone of defence: it had been decided in advance to abandon it in case of war. When war came, the French Government ordered its soldiers to drop back 10 kilometers from the frontier, and so Briey was left for the Germans to take. In protecting their precious iron and steel mines and factories—so much more precious to them than the lives of the people—the ironmasters followed the dictates of the pacifists, who say: "Do not arm, offer no resistance to the armies, remain passive. The iron masters proceeded on this principle: let the Belgians fight to stay the Germans; let anyone fight; but do not allow the fighting to take place where our sources of wealth may suffer."

As soon as war began, offensives were begun all along the Western front, except at Briey—sacred Briey. General Serrail, who was in charge of the Second Army there, submitted a plan for an offensive at Briey, but his plan was rejected and he was replaced by General Gerard.

The Franco-German Steel Magnates.

Briey must be protected from injury: French ironmasters desired that; but also, as Mr. Streit shows, the industrialists of Briey were not wholly French in their sympathies. French ironmasters owned mining concessions in German Lorraine, as well as in France, and Germans were interested in Briey mines as well as in Lorraine. The iron capitalists were internationalists, and they put their property and their profits before all other considerations. The de Wendel family owned mines, blast-furnaces, and steel-smelting plants in both Briey and German Lorraine, and controlled one-eighth of this mineral basin, which borders on both countries. Francois de Wendel, the president of the French iron and steel Combine, was a French Member of Parliament. His brother Charles was a naturalised German and member of the Reichstag. On the outbreak of war he resigned his seat and returned to France. The German steel magnate Thyssen, also powerful on both sides of the frontier, helped to supply war material to both France and Germany during the war. Gustave Téry, of "L'Oeuvre," observed that in the minutes of the French blast-furnace and steel corporation of Caen it was recorded on March 14th, 1916, that the Thyssen interests would be carefully safeguarded during the war, and that a part of the profits made by the company from supplying the French with munitions would be put aside for Thyssens, who would automatically and legally receive this sum after the war. Thyssen in 1919 confided to M. le Chatelier that he intended to naturalise one of his sons as a Frenchman to facilitate his exploitation of the iron mines of Normandy.

Patrioteering.

As has been observed above, the iron and steel Trust was closely connected with the hydro-electric Trust; they had the same general secretary, M. Robert Pinot. The hydro-electric Trust had also its non-patriotic tendencies. The hydro-electric Trust in February 1912 contracted to supply a "war stock" of ferro-silicon to the German firm of Krupps, since Germany had not enough ferro-silicon for its war industries, and would need large supplies, because war with France was expected about 1914. During 1912 and 1913 6,000 tons of ferro-silicon, sufficient to treat 600,000 tons of steel, were delivered to Krupps. A Frenchman, M. Riva-Berni,

carried out the negotiations on behalf of the French Trust.

M. Giraud-Jordan, a prominent member of the Committee of Forges, was also the Paris representative of the Lonza Hydro-Electric company, the offices of which were in Switzerland; but the majority stockholders in the company were Austro-German, and a German, Freydel, was at its head. The Lonza company during the war supplied Germany with its product, chiefly cyanide. Giraud-Jordan was a director of this company. He was also a director of the Hafslund, a Norwegian company, which sold its products to German munition makers during the war. The French hydro-electric trust was brought before a French court-martial for shipping 600,000 pounds of cyanide to the Lonza Company in January 1915. Giraud-Jordan and his fellow-patriots discussed whether they should "make the Swiss Government intervene through diplomatic channels in their interests, but it was unnecessary; the French Trust was acquitted by the French court-martial—the Trust was too powerful an interest to be punished.

Giraud-Jordan resigned his directorship of the Lonza Company, for appearance sake, in March 1915, promising to return in peacetime, and arranging to keep in touch with the company and to receive its minutes, reports, and monthly balances through an intermediary, whilst remaining the largest shareholder. At the same time, he kept the Lonza Company in touch with the doings of the Bozel Company in the same manner.

To the narrow but honest Nationalists, who can conceive nothing greater than national patriotism, all this is appalling. Small wonder that they should grow fanatical on the subject of the penetration of foreign capitalists and foreign capital; but in these days of great industrial undertakings foreign Capitalism penetrates more and more into every country.

A "Gentlemen's Agreement" to Safeguard Coal and Iron.

The respect paid to Briey by the French Army was paralleled by the respect shown by the German armies to the French coal mines in the Basin of Bruay in the department of Pas de Calais. A writer in the Paris financial journal, "L'Information," stated:

"Indeed, our coal mines in that part of Pas-de-Calais which was not invaded and which remained unharmed, produced 28,000 tons of coal a day, indispensable to our railways and war industries, particularly during the active submarine campaign. The Germans, on their side, could ask their Government: 'Why were not Bruay and the coal mines destroyed? Why, instead of attempting an unfruitful effort against Verdun in February 1916, didn't you make the same effort toward the coal basin of Pas-de-Calais?' They surely could have pierced our lines, since at that time the second and third trenches had not been dug."

"The motive of this prohibition of which the aviation officer speaks seems, according to rumours, to have been due to a tacit agreement between the belligerents. It would seem that we said to the Germans: 'We will not bombard Briey, from which you get your iron ore, if you will respect, on your side, Bruay and the coal basin of Pas-de-Calais.' [Italics in original.]

Evidently the Franco-German capitalists who were exploiting the Franco-German coal and metal areas were determined that their property should not be destroyed. They entered into what has been called "a gentlemen's agreement" to respect each other's property, just as the rival armies usually take care to spare the staff headquarters.

Keeping the War Business Going.

Was there not, however, another reason why Briey, held by the Germans, and Bruay, held by the French, were both for years immune from attack? Was it not also that for the coal, iron and steel owners the war busi-

ness was such good business that they were loth to allow it to be brought to an end by permitting an attack on the sources of war material which were keeping the guns at work on both sides?

Mr. Streit quotes a number of prominent people who declare that this was actually the case.

The war business was certainly very profitable, and the French Government, like the other Governments, was disposed to allow the great combines to profit without much check.

Communism is the only alternative to this sort of thing. So long as society is based on private interest, such evils will continue.

Strike, strike at the root of the evil: do not continue for ever putting plasters on its branches.

(Continued from page 2.)

the advertisement: that's the thing nowadays!"

"You're giving us a lot of points for Communism, you know," said Miss Mayence, "quite apart from what I may think of your friend's invention."

"What do you mean?"

"Well, if we had the Soviets, of course, the postmen's Soviets would get whatever they liked for their uniform—if they decided to have a uniform—at any rate for their working clothes. Your friend wouldn't be looking about for someone to put money into his invention: he would just go to the postmen and say: 'Would you like this for your coats?' Then if they liked the idea they would just ask the clothing Soviets to get it made for them, and everyone who wanted it would ask for it and get it. Your friend would get it, of course."

"Do you think the Soviets would be willing to put this contrivance in for them?"

"Oh, yes, if they really wanted it. When everyone takes a turn at productive work, instead of only one-third of us being producers, we shall not be so busy as we are now."

"But if my friend wouldn't have invented it, if he hadn't believed there might be a profit to be made out of it: what do you say to that? You can't answer it!" Saunders struck the table.

"Wouldn't your friend have thought: worth while to invent it for the sake of wearing it himself?"

"But he couldn't afford to have one made just for himself. How do you suppose he could pay for it? Why, it's the model that costs such a lot. It's only when you are making a quantity you can do 'em cheap."

"Money wouldn't come into it under Communism. Your friend would not have to pay for anything. But even supposing he couldn't persuade anyone else to wear his invention, and even supposing other workers thought it a waste of time to make up a model, just for him, in the regular productive working time, he would probably be able to get some metal worker he was friendly with to make the container for him in his spare time if he couldn't do it himself. He has been able to convince you that it is some use, and probably he could convince someone else that it was worth helping him to make a sample, if there were not the present difficulty, which he cannot surmount, of paying for the labour and materials. Under Communism we shall have well-equipped laboratories and workshops open to all who want to invent and experiment, and when we are all accustomed to doing some manual work we shall not be so helplessly dependent, as most people are, for getting their ideas carried out."

"But I don't think we shall put steel gutters on the eaves of our garments," said Penman.

Saunders turned on him sharply:

"In my opinion, it's a very practical contrivance."

The Work of 1923.

1922 has been a bad year for us, fellow-workers; a year of many misfortunes.

How have we met our misfortunes? How have we fought them?

On the whole, fellow-workers, we have not fought our misfortunes; we have submitted to them.

We have met our misfortunes as a weak, ill-organised force, drifting hopelessly, without any central purpose.

Reductions of wages have been proposed by the employers; we have rejected them with scorn—presently we have accepted them.

The gap system has been imposed on the workless; we have protested; but we have submitted.

Soldiers' pensions have been stopped; we have tolerated the injustice. Families have been evicted; we have allowed them to be flung into the street. Only occasionally have we protested. We have shown but little solidarity.

People have gone hungry in a land of plenty.

Comrades have been imprisoned; we have made only speeches in reply.

Why have we accepted unjust misfortunes like obedient lackeys, fellow-worker?

Why have we not put up a fight on behalf of suffering comrades?

The reason is that we have felt ourselves powerless.

Why did we feel ourselves powerless, seeing that Labour is, at bottom, all-powerful, because Labour provides the food, clothing, housing, and transport, and mans the armies and navies?

We felt ourselves powerless for two reasons, fellow-worker.

Firstly, we felt ourselves powerless, because we saw that when there is a scramble for jobs the workers lower each others' conditions of employment. Therefore, if our fight is to secure improved conditions under this system, the workers are seriously handicapped in the fight just now. We did not see a sporting chance of improving our conditions within the present system in 1922, fellow-worker; **and we could not bring ourselves to the point of fighting to smash the system.** That was the crux of the matter.

We shall not do any good, fellow-worker, so long as we run after the red herrings of reform, instead of beginning the big fight to smash the system.

That, fellow-worker, is the first reason, and a very logical reason, why we felt ourselves powerless in the year 1922.

The second reason, fellow-worker, is that we were not equipped for fighting. The workers' fighting (?) machinery consisted of a number of political parties constructed for getting members into Parliament, and of the Trade Unions which undertake to safeguard the interests of the workers on the industrial field.

We knew the Trade Unions could not better our position in 1922, fellow-workers; we had seen them beginning to go down like nine-pins in 1921.

We know that the Unions are not organised as the workers must be organised to fight a real trial of strength with Capitalism. We knew that there are many Unions with many conflicting policies, and that they are slow and hard to move, and that the Union officials are not prepared for a tug-of-war with Capitalism.

We knew that the workers in the shops were apathetic, that the Union was little more than a benefit society to them, that they took no real part in the work of the Unions, and had no real power in them.

Alas, fellow-worker, we had neither the will to fight for betterment, nor the equipment for fighting.

Some of us—and not a very small number—had the will, fellow-worker; some of us fully realised that betterment cannot be got except by an entire change of system; some of us were prepared to go for that, but those who had the will for change, fellow-worker, had not the industry and forethought to build the necessary organisation—to do the spade-work.

They spent their energies in hot air, fellow-workers; they blew them off in denouncing Lloyd George and Bonar Law. They buried their energies in conferences and resolutions.

They did not do the spade-work: they did not go to the fellow-workers in the factory, on the railway, in the mine and dockyard, and bring those fellow-workers together into groups of the All-Workers' Union ready to take control of the work without which Great Britain comes to a standstill.

They tried to organise and convert from the top: they did not go down to the bottom. They had no faith in their fellow-workers; they preferred to ask for help from Lloyd George or Bonar Law.

That is why we felt ourselves powerless in 1922, fellow-workers; but let us turn over a new leaf and begin the modest but necessary spade-work in 1923.

Moreover, fellow-workers, do not say, as some have said: "There does not seem to be very much doing in the industrial movement. we shall wait till things begin to move."

Let us make a start with the moving, fellow-workers; let us make a start with the spade.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE UNION.

Last week we published a letter from the British Empire Union offering Mr. David Prothero, a Communist, a post as salaried speaker, the object being, undoubtedly, to turn one more effective propagandist into a servant of reaction, if money could tempt him to accept that position.

Our readers should remember that, though the B.E.U. has invited a Communist to speak for them, it exists to oppose all that Communism stands for. The B.E.U. declares that it aims at counteracting Communism by outdoor meetings, posters, leaflets, newspaper articles, advertisements, cinema shows, etc. It intends to found a college for training

the workers in support of Capitalism and the master class.

Amongst the patrons and members of the B.E.U. are the following rich men, imperialists and reactionaries:

Lord Carson.

Lord Leith of Fyvie, owning estates at Fyvie Castle, Aberdeen, at Feners, South Devon, and at Aylesbury, Bucks.

The Duke of Northumberland, owning 169 acres of land and 244,500 acres mineral rights, which bring in £69,000 a year.

The Duke of Somerset, owning 25,400 acres of land.

The Earl of Plymouth, owning 37,500 acres in Britain, 350,000 acres in British East Africa, chairman of Barry Railway Company.

The Earl of Bradford, owning 22,000 acres.
Lord Dunleath, owning 15,000 acres.
Viscountess Churchill, whose father, the Earl of Lonsdale, owns 175,000 acres.
Lord Astor.

Earl Bathurst, who owns 12,000 acres and the "Morning Post."

The Earl of March, director of the City Equitable Fire Insurance and Commercial Bank of London.

Sir John Hewett, chairman or director of Hyderabad (Deccan) Co., Imperial Tea Co., Ltd., General Electric Co., British North Borneo Timber Co., Imperial Ottoman Bank, National Bank of India.

J. C. Gould, M.P., chairman of J. C. Gould and Co. (Steamships), Gould Steamships and Industrials, Ltd., Dacia Romano Petroleum Syndicate, Ltd., Richardson Duck and Co. (Steamships), Blair and Co. (marine engineers). He is also a director of British Steamship Owners' Association, Fairfield Steamship Co., Ship Salvage Corporation.

These are but a few of the wealthy persons behind the B.E.U. The vast sum of £140,000,000 in paid-up capital belongs to the firms with which its vice-presidents and directors are connected, to say nothing of the hundreds of other capitalists associated with the B.E.U.

Further information about the British Empire Union next week.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

All books reviewed may be obtained at the "Dreadnought" Bookshop.

The Origin and Evolution of the Soul, by Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr, Kerr's, Chicago.—Deals with the Invention of the Soul, the Invention of Paradise, the Eclipse of the Idea of the Soul, the Re-birth of the Idea of the Soul, the Invention of Hell, the Idea of the Soul and the Future, Life Among the Early Christians. An exceedingly useful handbook. It should be in every proletarian library.

An Outline of Modern Imperialism. (The Plebs, 2/6.)—This was drafted by Thomas Ashcroft and revised by a committee. There is a foreword by George Hicks (A.W.B.T.W.).

לעזט און פארשפרייט דעם

ארבעטער פריינד

אנארכיסטיש-קאמוניסטישער ארגאן

רעדאקטירט פון דר" י. מ. זאלקינד.

ערשיינט צוויי וועכענטלאך.

אינגעלנער פארקויף 2/6 א קאפיע.

אבאנאמענט:

יערלאך 6/6, אין אַמעריקא 1.50 ד.

צו אדרעסירן:

"WORKERS FRIEND"

163, Jubilee Street, London, E. 1.

COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT.

Central London Group meets Thursdays, 152 Fleet Street, 8 p.m. For Group business, 9 to 10 p.m. Speakers' class and study circle, open to non-members, taken by Sylvia Pankhurst. Secretary, S. Cahill, 60 Limes Grove, Lewisham, S.E. 13.

THE ALL-WORKERS' UNION OF REVOLUTIONARY WORKSHOP COMMITTEES.

For all particulars, write Secretary, c/o "Workers' Dreadnought," 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

Send for the Catalogue of the "Dreadnought" Publishers and Bookshop. It will be supplied free on application to 152 Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

TO SEAMEN AND TRAVELLERS.

Seamen and other comrades from overseas should call at the "Dreadnought" office. The Australian Seamen's Journal and other Colonial, American, French, Dutch, German, Italian, Bulgarian papers, etc., may be obtained there.

The Karmi, a monthly journal, advocates the cause of Labour in India. Published by the Employees' Association, at No. 72 Canning Street, Calcutta, Post Box No. 2352.

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