ONE PENNY

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR GOING TO THE ROOT.

Vol. X. No. 48. February 16th, 1924. WEEKLY

LINES FROM "MASSES AND MEN."

By Ernst Toller.

Group of young working men:

. . . . . .

We waste ourselves with words of hate and fury.
The masters build their palaces, while our brothers
Rot in the trenches.
Meadows and dancing colours, play,
Blossom about us—in our nights
We read of it and howl to heaven
A craving lives in us for knowledge . . .
But when they took the best of life
It turned to evil. . . .
Sometimes we touch it in the theatres,
So tender and so fine, it mocks
Us with its beauty.
They have destroyed our youth in schools,
Our souls are broken and our lives
Shout want—raw want.
We are the steaming stench of want.
What else are we to-day?
We will not wait!

Group of farm labourers:

We have been hounded off our mother earth.
Rich masters buy the land
As they buy venal women;
Make sport of her—
Our blessed mother earth;
Thrust our rough arms
Into munition factories,
Where we, uprooted, wither.
Joyless towns break our strength.
We want the land!
The land for all!

The Masses in the Hall:

The land for all!

The Woman:

When I passed through the poor quarters,
Where grey drips
Through shingled roofs
And fungus grows on bedroom walls,
A sick man stuttered:
The street is better—almost better—
We live in sties, don't we? in sties!
His eyes were shy,
And I was shamed with him. . . .
But would you know the way, brothers,
The only remedy for us
Weak ones,
Who hate the cannons?
Strike! Not a hand's turn more!
To strike is action.

WAR.

War,
I abhor,
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street,
Of drum and fife, and I forget,
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchering without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright drunk
Of heady music, sweet as hell;
And even my peace-abiding feet,
Go marching with the marching feet,
For yonder goes the fife,
And what care I for human life?
The tears fill my astonished eyes,
And my full heart is like to break;
And yet 'tis all embannered lies
A dream those drummers make.

O it is wickedness to clothe,
Yon hideous grinning thing that stalks,
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the thing they loathe.

Art, thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this;
O snap the fife, and still the drum,
And show the monster as she is.

RICHARD LE GALLIENNE.

ON FOREIGN POLICY.

By Sylvia Pankhurst.

Several readers ask whether there is any alternative to what is called a "British" foreign policy, and to the building up of a balance of power to counter that of France or any government which may seem to threaten the British Empire?

Our answer is: Yes; there is an alternative foreign policy which is the only policy for Socialists, Communists, Anarchists—all, whatever they call themselves, who oppose the capitalist system.

To gain a proper perspective view of the international situation it is essential to realise that the governments of all the powers are contending to secure the advantage. From this cause arose the Great War.

At the close of the Great War the Allied victors contended amongst themselves for the spoils of victory. Undoubtedly the British Government secured at the time the lion's share, in the German colonies, Palestine and Mesopotamia, with its oil. Undoubtedly, too, the British Government got the better of the French in the arrangements made shortly after in relation to oil and other concessions, both in French territory and other parts of the world.

Undoubtedly since that time the French Government has become more and more openly aggressive in its efforts for supremacy. The British Government has stolen a march in regard to oil. The French Government has retaliated by taking possession of the Ruhr. coal. It recks as little how the workers who dig Ruhr coal are affected, as the British cared for the natives of the German colonies.

The guileless pacifist, who is unconsciously affected by the prevailing propaganda of British policy, protests that one cannot compare the natives of African colonies with the workers of the Ruth. That, however, is not the reason why British policy at once objected to the invasion of the Ruhr. The objection was based on the fear that France, by securing control of the Ruhr mines and iron and steel works, would become both militarily and industrially a greater force than Britain. British policy, perhaps, regretted the starvation of German people, but British policy did not shrink from imposing starvation during the blockade of Germany or Russia, and British policy was not deterred by such considerations of humanity when it invaded Soviet Russia, or when it provided the Czar with funds for a bloody coercion of his people after the 1905 Revolution, and the establishment of the first Duma.

There had been nothing to choose, morally speaking, between the policies of governments of the great powers, over a long period of years—each has been striving for supremacy—in wealth, in fighting strength, and in the possession of the machinery and raw material from which munitions of war may be produced. The powers have contracted alliances with other nations, not from friendship or the love of peace, but in order to add the strength and resources of their allies to their own strength and resources, in case of war with the great power which they have regarded as their immediate rival. In order to crush Power A, Power B has united with Powers C, D, and E, whilst Powers F, G, and H have been called into alliance by Power A. Power A being crippled, Powers B and C have begun to fear each other. Power B then forms an alliance with Power A, which it lately fought, and all the other powers re-group themselves about the principle antagonists. Again and again repeated, that is the history of modern Europe.

Our correspondents, who still believe in the necessity for a national policy, will go thus far with us. They will agree that the whole mad rivalry for power is an ignoble thing; but they protest that one must take the world as one finds it; "What is one to do?" Living within the jurisdiction of Power B, they worked for peace by negotiation with Power A, protesting with earnestness that they were, nevertheless, as patriotic as any, and were anxious their own country should thereby lose no advantages. They devoutly prayed that should there be a fight to a finish, the victory must, by all means, fall to their own Power B. Now that Power A is vanquished, and Power C emerges as a rival, whilst anxious to maintain the peace, they are determined that Power C shall secure no advantages which might threaten the superiority of Power B. They are eager to heal Power A from its war disasters, both from motives of humanity—and also that it may prove a useful bulwark against the aggressive tendencies of Power C. Their desire to check the growth of Power C they declare to be entirely altruistic. Power B has secured by aggression an Empire on which the sun never sets, and the rulership of the seas. Our pacifist correspondents desire their own Power B to retain these advantages, both in order to assure its national prosperity, and in order that it may have the power of the big stick to prevent the other governments behaving naughtily to each other.

Our pacifist correspondents are aware that the big stick is not an ethical weapon, but they urge that if Power B does not wield it mightily, Power C will snatch it. They reflect that though equality may be best of all, if one Power is to be strongest it were best that it should be the Power within whose borders they happen to reside.

This is why the Socialist Parties of the world supported the late war.

"No," protest our pacifist correspondents; "this case is different! The pretext for British participation in the last war was the invasion of Belgium and the desire of Germany to rule the world. We know that Belgium was never neutral, and that the German Government was no worse than the French; whilst the British was not guiltless. We believe that the late war could have been avoided, or at least ended, by negotiation. Consider," they urge, "the invasion of the Ruhr, and the suffering of the German people; consider the way in which France is subsidising the armies of Poland and other States and the military alliances she is making. We cannot be expected to stand by and see the French Government make itself the military dictator of the world." Moreover, they ask: "What would you have us do? What is *your* policy?"

Our policy is to stand altogether aloof from capitalist patriotism. So far from approving the maintenance of armies and navies to protect the Empire, we say: Let the Empire be

broken up into its component parts. Let the subject nations work out their own salvation as they please; it is from the inner life of their people, not from the domination of an alien militarism, that their salvation will arise. As for preparing that the country we happen to live in may be victorious in the next war, we realise, as internationalists, that it does not matter which country is victorious, and we observe that the country which is beaten is perhaps that which will make the greatest advance in social evolution.

When the scare cry is raised that the French Government will dominate Europe, we answer that we must leave it to the people of France and to the people of invaded Germany to deal with French aggression.

It is objected that the French working masses support M. Poincaré in his Ruhr invasion. Certainly the patriotic French Socialists are saying that, regrettable as the invasion may be, the prestige of France is now involved, and there can be no evacuation till success has been achieved. Capitalist patriotism has widespreading roots in all countries.

It is worth considering, however, whether the hold which aggressive French militarism has on the French masses will be weakened by the menace of the big stick in the hands of Britain. Obviously it will not.

It is argued that British troops must be kept in Germany to counteract the aggressive action of the French, or to maintain the interests of British trade. Those who are working for the destruction of capitalism will not recognise trade interests as a part of their objective. They will understand that British troops in Germany will oppose any uprising of the people against the dominant capitalism, whether it be German or foreign. British troops have, in fact, been used to coerce the German workers in numerous industrial disputes, notably in forcing workers to submit to the abandonment of the eight-hour day. We should demand and endeavour to secure the recall of British troops from the Ruhr.

Our pacifist patriots are concerning themselves because the French Government does not repay its debt to the British; some of them still think that the German Government should pay what may be declared by the more moderate experts to be reasonable reparations.

Such things should not concern those who desire to end the capitalist system. We should not lift a finger to secure the payment either of French debts or German reparations. Some of our pacifist patriots suggest that the bone of contention in the Ruhr should be shared between the rival claimants to avoid a quarrel. They suggest an international company in which there shall be German, British, French and Belgian shares. Others suggest an inter-allied Committee of British, French, Belgians, and perhaps Americans, to control the finances of Germany. Both these suggestions are immoral even from the standard of the honest bourgeois who believes in private ownership of production, distribution and transport. That such suggestions are made and seriously entertained by people who want to be humane and honest, shows the demoralising effect which the great war has had. Such foreign control for the purpose of exploiting the production of the country, places the yoke of alien militarism upon the workers of the country concerned. It raises a barrier against all progress. The fact that the proposed military yoke would be inter-allied, instead of merely French, would but make it the more difficult for the German workers to overthrow.

When the measure ratifying inter-allied control of Austrian finance was passing through the House of Commons, the Labour Party voted unanimously for it. Yet now it is recognised that the Allied financiers reaped the greatest benefit from the consequent loan as soon as control came into force, every proletarian organisation in Austria, even the more moderate, began to protest against the hardships it was inflicting upon the workers. The control has merely stabilised capitalism in Austria for a time.

Platitudes about the high intentions of British foreign policy are easily uttered, but a British policy is a policy primarily directed to securing the most that can be obtained without war for British traders and concessionaries, and to building up a balance of naval, military and air forces which will give the greater strength to the British Empire and its Allies. That is a capitalist policy. Inevitably it is a war policy in the long run.

The same must be said of a French policy, a German policy—any *national* policy. What is the alternative?

The alternative for us in Britain, as for other peoples in other countries, is to stand aloof from the alliances and the rivalries, endeavouring, whilst refusing alliances with the Governments, to fraternise with the peoples.

And should war come?

If war should come our business would be to declare the general strike against it, to declare the workers' revolution, and to fraternise with the invading armies should they appear.

And should our action result only in the defeat of our country's arms, should we suffer the hard fate of a beaten nation?

Then we should only endure the lot which might have been ours even had we fought the capitalists' war with all our fervour; we should only endure the lot which we have many times helped to impose on others.

Moreover, we should have lit a beacon in the hearts of men and women which would not be extinguished until the capitalist system and its wars were destroyed for ever.

Call the British troops back from Germany: the workers there will throw off the yoke of capitalism more easily without them.

Leave the French Government, if it will, to attempt the subjection of all Europe. Leave the French people to rebel under the strain of maintaining the resultant vast militarism. Leave the peoples of Europe to throw off the yoke of a single militarism. Do not multiply the forces with which they must contend.

SOUTH AFRICAN NEWS.

At the annual Conference of the South African Labour Party, held at Pretoria on January 3rd, the following resolutions were carried unanimously:—

1. "That this Conference approves and endorses the agreement between Col. Creswell and General Hertzog, as defined in Col. Creswell's letter of April, 1923, and confirmed by General Hertzog in his reply of April 19, both of which letters were published in the South African Press."

2. "That the South African Labour Party appreciates the actions taken by the British Empire Labour Congress in August, 1921, for the purpose of discussing matters of common interest and agrees to the request that the South African Labour Party be represented by five delegates, and that such delegates be elected at this conference, and that the Party incurs no financial liability in the matter of the delegates' expenses to the London Congress."

We are turning the corner. In 1919 the number of summonses issued at Caledon Square, Cape Town, was 5,281; in 1920, 5,584; in 1921, 7,989; and in 1922, 8,610. According to the local press, the present year is showing signs of being even larger—8,543 being already issued. Writs of execution and arrest have shown alarming increases also right through the Cape Peninsula. It will, therefore, be seen that in spite of South Africa "turning the corner" so many times, this year's insolvencies are well ahead of last year's.

At the South African Commercial Traveller's Association held in the Y.M.C.A. Hall, Johannesburg, at which 60 delegates were present, the view was generally expressed that it was undesirable to admit lady commercial travellers to membership. The Secretary explained that application had been made by a lady for membership, to which the Grand Council could not see its way to accede. The rule book, said the Secretary, showed that the rules were framed to deal with males only. Wherever women were employed, continued the Secretary, it had the tendency of a competitive nature against the labour of men. The Association's aims were to help to assist women, but it would be well advised not to admit women as members.

One delegate said: "We have no room for women in an organisation of this character. (Applause.) That the Grand Council acted wisely in excluding women from the Association."

At the S.A. Party Congress Dinner Mr. Hallard, K.C., in referring to the colour bar, said: "The recent decision in the Johannesburg Magistrate's Courts declaring that the regulation which had been in force was ultra vires, was not going to make the slightest difference in the policy of the party. The S.A. Party policy had always been that it would not tolerate the intrusion of black or coloured in the Provinces or spheres of white men in South Africa. That was the policy laid down from the first and reiterated by General Smuts and other members of the Ministry. It was an unalterable foundation of the S.A. Party programme."

ISAAC VERMONT.

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' REVOLUTION.

By HERMAN GORTER.

II.

The proclamation by the Bolshevists of the right to self-determination of all nations caused the detaching from Soviet Russia of Finland, the Baltic Provinces, Poland, the Ukraine and the Caucasus. This resulted in the downfall of the proletarian revolution in most of these countries.

The self-determination slogan was a bourgeois-capitalist one. Either the Bolshevists proclaimed it from weakness in the fear that if they did not give these States their freedom they could not smash up Czarism, or, as it appears now, they wanted, even then, a national Russian State. The doubts both as to the power of Communism to triumph and the necessity of nationalism were inspired by the peasants.

The enrolment of the proletariat into the Red Army was a proletarian-Communist measure. The admission of the peasants into the army was a bourgeois-capitalist measure, for the peasants would, and will, prove themselves the enemies of Communism, both economically and militarily.

Undoubtedly the peasant was willing to fight against the counter-revolution, in so far as it threatened the private property of the peasants in the soil. The peasants fought against Yudenitch, Koltchak and Wrangle. The Bolshevists might be able to keep both the peasants and the Proletarians in the army by giving them better food and clothing than they could get outside, but could the peasants still fight for the Bolshevists after their own private property was secured and the counter-revolution of the big landowners was no more? No, the peasants would certainly not do that.

A very interesting question in this regard was the fate of the Bolshevist campaign in Poland in 1920. Why did the Russian Army then suddenly retire? When the writer, on behalf of the Communist Workers' Party, asked this question in Moscow at the sitting of the Executive of the Third International in November, 1920, Trotsky and Karsky gave no clear answer. The explanations were confused. One said the fault lay with the civil service, another with the military. We now believe the true answer which was kept from us is that the peasants did not want to continue the attack on European capitalism. As soon as their property was secured against the foreigner they would not war any more against European capitalism. The peasants are the majority of the Russian Army. One must no longer reckon on their assistance in a European revolution.

A genuine proletarian revolution will not have peasants in its army, for its army must be wholly Communist.

The peace of Brest Litovsk was a bourgeois, or capitalist-Democratic one. A real proletarian revolution would have remained the enemy of all capitalist Powers, whilst waiting for and assisting the rising of the proletariat in other countries.

It was proletarian-Communist to give political power to the workers. It was bourgeois to give it to the peasants. A proletarian revolution in Germany and England will not give political power to such elements until their deeds have proved them Communists.

The suppression of the independence and self-expression of the workers was also bourgeois-capitalist. The workers and their organisations did not get the leadership and control of industry, transport and distribution.

The Bureaucratic despotism of the leaders was also bourgeois-capitalist. The corruption was also bourgeois-capitalist.

The party dictatorship of the Bolshevists was in the highest degree bourgeois-capitalist. Party dictatorship will always become so. In leader-dictatorship lies the kernel of the bourgeois-capitalist revolution, and in it is the greatest proof that the Russian revolution was chiefly, and in its origin, a bourgeois-capitalist one.

The party dictatorship was in its origin bourgeois-capitalist. It began through the power of the peasants, the non-proletarian class. A party dictatorship could overpower and lead the peasant class in Russia. A proletarian class dictatorship could not do this, for a dictatorship of the proletarian class will always aspire to pure Communism. Once it has the power to govern the proletariat will not content itself with less. The enormous power, the great numbers of the peasants prevented pure Communism from being achieved.

The proletariat as a class could not lead the dictatorship. This could only be done by a party—the Bolshevist Party, and this only by not introducing pure Communism, by making concessions to the peasants, the private owners of the land, and to the capitalists. A proletarian class would never do this. The awakened proletariat will not make concessions; it will demand everything for itself. Its watchword will remain unto the end:

"We have been nothing: we shall be everything."

The Bolshevist party held the dictatorship through the might and power of the peasants. This party dictatorship, because of the might of the peasants, was of necessity mainly capitalistic. It dominated, instead of representing, the proletariat, over which it was the despot. It may be that this dictatorship was inevitable; it may be that, under the circumstances, it was the best that could be had; nevertheless, it was a despotism. It dictated to the workers what concessions they must make and what advantages were to be given to the peasants.

It could not have been otherwise in a land so largely agrarian. Having originated from the power of the peasants, the dictatorship of the Bolshevists was necessarily bourgeois-capitalist.

We are proud that Rosa Luxemburg in her voice from the grave has painted the nature of the party dictatorship and its effect on the revolution, just as we have done. She says a few dozen party leaders of inexhaustible energy and endless idealism direct and rule. Amongst them are in reality one dozen eminent heads who lead and an élite of the workmen which is called from time to time to applaud the speeches of the leaders and to vote unanimously for the resolutions laid before them. At bottom, therefore, it is a clique arrangement—a dictatorship it is true; but not a dictatorship of the proletariat, simply a dictatorship of a handful of politicians; in short, a dictatorship in the bourgeois sense.

"Yes: dictatorship . . . but this dictatorship must be the work of the class and not that of a leading minority in the name of the class: that is to say, it must, step by step, arise from the active participation of the class, remain under its direct influence, and be subordinated to the control of publicity and be the outcome of the political experience of the whole people."

The Communist Workers' Party and the Communist Workers' International can echo the words of Rosa Luxemburg, but instead of the "whole people" we always read the proletariat.

Rosa Luxemburg did not understand that all this could not happen in Russia; that no class dictatorship was possible there, because the proletariat was too small and the peasantry too mighty.

She did not see, because her life was too short, that the Bolshevists had built their party dictatorship not only out of the might of the peasants, but that they were compelled to use their dictatorship through the might of the peasants, for the bourgeois revolution in Russia. They used their party dictatorship always more in the interest of the peasants—that is to say, in the interest of capitalist private property, and against the proletariat and Communism.

The productive and class conditions in Russia forced the revolution to be to a great extent a bourgeois one. The proletarian class conditions gave the Bolshevists the leadership. This leadership could not, on account of the productive and class conditions, be a class dictatorship; it had to be a party dictatorship, and these very conditions compelled the party dictatorship to be a bourgeois capitalist one.

Party dictatorship is typical of a bourgeois revolution, in a society based on private property. By such a revolution one class disposes another class, but itself remains on the basis of private property. The newly risen class uses and cheats the class beneath it.

A bourgeois revolution is always a revolution of a minority against the majority.

The proletarian revolution which aims at being truly Communist, must be a revolution of the majority against the minority. Therefore it must take place, or at least have its beginning, in a truly proletarian country.

If the revolution comes from the majority, or, at least, represents the interests of the majority, then it does not require a party dictatorship, it has no need to cheat the masses by such means. Then the dictatorship of the class is inevitable.

The Party dictatorship in Russia was the surest sign that the revolution was bourgeois-capitalist.

We shall postpone, till we have treated the second period, a detailed exposure of the fact that even in the first period of their power, the Bolshevists showed their bourgeois-democratic or capitalist policy by their influence on the proletariat other countries through the Third International.

ENVIRONMENT.

"Rubbish!" snorted Mrs. Vavasour. "If these people who live in slums want to leave them, they can."

"Houses are to be had anywhere for the asking," I replied mildly, "and wages will be raised to pay the bigger rents, I presume."

"I don't see what difference it makes to people whether they live in slums or not," retorted Mrs. Vavasour, smoothing her fur coat with a caressing hand. "If they work hard and save, instead of drinking and gambling, they will be able to live in respectable homes."

"Truly a worthy ideal," said I, "but where are they to get their ideals from—these people who live among dirt and squalor?"

"Every man is born with noble instincts," said Mrs. Vavasour, loftily, "and if he has a spark of manhood in him, he will rise superior to such trivial circumstances."

With that parting shot she swept majestically away.

. . . . . .

"These violets are lovely, are they not? And how the sweet scent brings the happy springtime near," said Mrs. Vavasour, sentimentally.

"Lovely!" I exclaimed, "and where have these come from, so long before spring?"

"Glorious Devon! where the sea laps at the foot of red cliffs, where the air is pure and untainted by the foul smoke of manufacturing towns," said the lady, sighing enviously.

"But I don't see why we should not grow violets as nice as those, even in this dirty place," I said innocently.

"Rubbish!" cried Mrs. Vavasour. "Why, the smoke and the soot, the poor soil and the lack of sunshine make it well-nigh impossible."

"That's strange," said I, still speaking innocently. "A lady told me a few days ago that such things make no difference. If the violets are planted, even in poor soil, they know when spring comes it is time to be growing."

"Well that lady is a fool," said Mrs. Vavasour with conviction. "Anyone with the smallest intelligence knows how much effect good soil and sunshine have upon flowers. Ridiculous!"

"I am very sorry, Mrs. Vavasour," I said, edging away, "but that lady was yourself—wait a minute—only you were speaking of men, not flowers."

She never talks to me now.

E.D.

PROFESSIONAL WASHER-WOMEN.

"I rather like washing," said the lady at the villa. I stared. "Of course," she continued, "I send all the heavy things out." Of course!

No woman dislikes washing blouses or serviettes, but where can one find the woman who enjoys washing half-a-dozen blankets or two pairs of grimy, greasy overalls?

Washing day is the bane of all working-class families; particularly those who live in houses which do not possess a wash-house. In such houses washing day turns the kitchen into a miniature pawnshop; bundles of clothes scattered about in confusion. Cooking has to be squeezed in between periods of boiling "whites" and wringing "coloureds." Cold meat for dinner always accompanies a washing day. When the copper lid is lifted clouds of steam fill the house, and the roof turns black with dampness, while the paper begins to peel off the wall. How the canary manages to live through this weekly occurrence of steam and draughts—doors and windows must be open—is beyond comprehension.

Yet these hard-working house-wives who weekly turn the wringer are well off when compared with the woman "who takes in washing." These poor struggling ones are the slaves of the wringer. Not one day, but often four and five days they spend over the tubs. Widows with young families to support, and wives whose husbands are out of work, are condemned to carry the burden of others who can afford to pay for their unpleasant work being done.

A house-wife once confided to me that she felt ten years older after a day's washing. What must the "professional washer-woman" feel like after four days? Four days among the steam and soap-suds! Four days spent bending over a tub and whirling the handle of a wringing machine. And the payment, which is often as low as five shillings, can never be sufficient. The "hired help" who goes out to wash is even worse paid than this because she has her meals provided. Meals which are only too often given grudgingly and contemptuously as one feeds a dog.

Such heroic struggling to keep the home going and the family respectable must have its reward some day. The pity is that often the heroine does not live to see the fruits of her labour.

E. D.

Workers' Dreadnought

Founded 1914.

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

All Matter for Publication— To THE EDITOR.
Business Communications — To THE MANAGER
WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT,
152, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. Post free.

Three months (13 weeks) ..... 1s. 7½d.
Six months (26 weeks) ..... 3s. 3d.
One year (52 weeks) ..... 6s. 6d.

Subscriptions can start from any week.

Vol. X. No. 48. Saturday, Feb. 16th, 1924.

Our View.

This Government is a Coalition Government, in fact, whatever it may be called in name, that factor must always be borne in mind. This has been, and will be, clearly evident in all its actions. If proof of this were needed, no better proof could be asked than Lord Chelmsford's statement, that Lord Parmoor, Lord Haldane, and he have agreed to enter the Government, being persons detached from politics, because the Government programme has been disclosed to them, and they have agreed to it.

* * *

Some Social Reform Measures will undoubtedly be introduced by the present Government, because every party has regarded the increased support given to the Labour Party at the last election, as a sign that the electors are impatient with existing conditions, and that some ameliorations are required to placate them.

The retiring King's Speech of Mr. Baldwin's Government was an admission of this view, and Mr. MacDonald admits that he will use the Baldwin speech as a quarry to which it would be safe to go for his reform materials. It must be clearly realised that any concession to popular need which may be looked for, will be measured, as is always the case, by the extent of the pressure coming from the people outside.

* * *

The Parliamentary Session opened ignominiously, with an ill-mannered rush for seats, in which an old man was knocked down, and women members were thrust out of their places in the queue.

Questions at once revealed the old-time officialdom triumphing over that visionary "new spirit," which has been so lavishly promised. Mr. Stephen Walsh adroitly scrapped an election pledge of Mr. MacDonald on pensions for ex-Army ranker officers.

Mr. Snowden asserted, like his predecessors, that he is defending the interests of British traders against the refusal of the German Government to refund charges under the Reparation Recovery Act.

Mr. MacDonald indicated that the only reduction in Cabinet Ministers' salaries is that the Lord Chancellor had asked to be paid £6,000, instead of £10,000, and had relinquished the pension of £5,000, which he has been drawing for having done the same work before; also that Mr. MacDonald himself will be content to draw a salary only as Prime Minister, and will relinquish the further £5,000 a year he might get as Foreign Secretary. On the other hand, Mr. Clynes is to get £5,000 a year, instead of the usual £2,000 as Lord Privy Seal, because he is also acting as leader of the House of Commons. The office of Lord Privy Seal is, of course, one to which no duties are attached. In some of the war-time Coalition Cabinets, the salaries were pooled, but in reply to questions, Mr. MacDonald said that the whole question ought to be reviewed, as it is most inequitable, but "I will not agree to it being reviewed whilst we ourselves are in office, unless it comes spontaneously from the whole House of Commons."

It seems that tradition is to have its way under the new Government in this and everything.

"The expenses are enormous," Mr. MacDonald has told the press, but expenses of dining and wining the Government cliques, both national and international, are not compulsory, except to those who are afraid to defy the conventions.

* * *

As to "Poplarism," it is fighting its duel with the more Conservative elements in the Coalition behind the Labour Government. "Poplarism" is the policy of the dole and the bandaging of the sore wounds of poverty. It may wash the feet of the poor from pity, and for the welfare of its soul, but it leaves the poor still in poverty. It will have to contend with the stern economics of the thrifty who once were poor, but who, through good constitutions, and the accentuated development of their acquisitive and managing facilities, are poor no longer. It will have to contend with the small prejudices and the impecuniosities of the small middle-class, the hardships of the small-wage workers, and the anxiety of Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues to prove they are not extravagant.

"Poplarism" has scored a point in the withdrawal of the Mond Order, and the surcharges which arose under it; but Mr. MacDonald has protested that this was only a small administrative matter, the revision of which was already under consideration by his predecessors, and that its withdrawal is not to be the signal that "the Red is to be flown by every Board of Guardians from Land's End to John o' Groats." It is not, he asserts, to be a charter of extravagance for the Boards of Guardians or any other spending body, for the Labour Government is seeking to secure the confidence of all classes.

One cannot attack capitalist vested interests and retain the confidence of those interests. That is clear, but obviously vested interests need fear no serious attack from this Government.

* * *

Housing is the one question in which the Labour Government may be expected to produce tangible and substantial results. Heavy Government subsidies will be required to modify the prevailing capitalist conditions, in order to produce a large number of habitable dwellings at rents the workers can manage to pay. It will turn out to be an expensive business, attended by much profiteering. An army of non-producers will draw sustenance from the scheme. These things are inherent in the capitalist system. Nevertheless, from the vast costly mountain which will arise, it should be safe to anticipate that enough houses will be brought forth to provide a definite easement of the over-crowding situation. Otherwise the political careers of Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues will be truncated more quickly than would otherwise have been the case.

The strongest guarantees that something substantial will at last be done for housing, are that the workers who build the houses are to be brought more or less into direct consultation—and that the people who want houses have grown impatient.

* * *

Unemployment is the other great problem with which the working classes expect the Labour Government to deal. Whoever may be persuaded that nothing much can be done by palliative methods, the Labour Government asserts its competence to cope with the question, and Mr. MacDonald declares that great schemes are under weigh. He announces the abolition of the gap, and of the selection of uncovenanted benefit; the uncovenanted benefit is to apply in all cases which meet the conditions laid down.

What further modifications may be introduced into Unemployment Insurance, and whether insurance is to replace the relief to the unemployed by Boards of Guardians, Mr. MacDonald has not made clear. We await the development of the scheme. One curious fact, however, he has strongly emphasised.

* * *

It is as physician-in-chief to the capitalist system that Mr. MacDonald has taken office. He does not regard the condition of private enterprise as at all hopeless. He does not consider the patient as suffering from a mortal disease. Some drops of State medicine, from prescriptions already made up by his predecessors, he believes will induce a swift recovery. That is the really amazing fact about the Labour Government. Amazing as it is, however, it is not a new phenomenon in the world, that those who have won their way amongst the people as prophets of a new social order, should take office with promises to restore the old system to its full vigour. Such a one was Dr. Hilferding, in Germany, whose ignominious failure has but lately been recorded.

* * *

Here are the most pregnant sentences uttered by Mr. MacDonald, in declaring to Parliament the policy of his Government:

"We shall therefore concentrate not first of all on the relief of unemployment, but on *the restoration of trade.*

"*We are not going to diminish industrial capital,* in order to provide relief. . .

"I wish to make it perfectly clear that the Government have no intention of drawing off from the normal channels of trade large sums for extemporised measures which can only be palliatives. . . .

"The necessity of expenditure for subsidising schemes in direct relief of unemployment will be judged in relation to *the greater necessity for maintaining undisturbed the ordinary financial facilities and resources of trade and industry.* . . .

"We therefore propose to speed up the trade facilities which lapsed in November, 1923, and which require to be re-invigorated. We shall deal with export credits, and extend the period for which they will operate. That does not mean that we shall require to ask for more money, because there are unexpended balances which will practically cover the extended period of the operations.

"The Cabinet . . . has to consider how far certain forms of taxes enter directly into the cost of production, and hamper the trade of the country, and how far certain other taxes are only taxes upon luxury."

To consider taxation and the foreign exchanges, Mr. MacDonald proposes to set up a Committee of business men—no new proceeding! There is something of a decidely Lloyd Georgian flavour about much that Mr. MacDonald says.

* * *

Calling capitalism back to health is the policy of the new Government. Liberals and Tories have tried to work the miracle and have failed. Why does anyone believe that Mr. MacDonald may succeed where the older parties could not? Some believe that a Labour Government will be able to induce the workers to subordinate their interests and safeguards for the sake of their employers' trade, as they did during the war for their employers' victory. Some believe that temporary sacrifices which capitalism must make for its ultimate health may be agreed to by the rival capitalist politicians behind the screen of a Labour Government which can be blamed in case of failure.

The difference between Poplarism and Reformism of the MacDonald type is that whilst Poplar attempts to patch up the disorders which capitalism has created amongst the Have Nots, MacDonaldism attempts to deal with the disorders afflicting the Haves, so

that their prosperity may be renewed, and crumbs may fall from their well-laden tables to the working classes as before.

To end capitalism is attempted neither by Poplar Labourism, nor by MacDonald Labourism.

* * *

Mr. MacDonald's foreign policy, if one may judge from his first Parliamentary utterance as Prime Minister, already approximates much more closely to that of its predecessors than it did when he was in opposition. Instead of that firm treatment of France, which he and his colleagues declared necessary, nothing is now heard, but stories of the good impression which Mr. MacDonald has made upon France. The Labour Premier is at pains to show his friendliness towards the French Government, even dropping into the phrase, "M. Poincaré and I," as though to emphasise the perfect understanding which has been arrived at. When Mr. McNeill, Lord Curzon's late assistant, asked the Labour Premier to explain where his policy differs from that of his predecessors, Mr. MacDonald replied: "I think I had better not."

When out of office, Mr. MacDonald never tired of complaining that Britain was being made the tool of French policy; in office he says that the British relations with France were unfriendly when he arrived, and that he is now pursuing the task of reconciliation.

Having adopted the rôle of the all-wise mentor of Europe, perhaps Mr. MacDonald proposes to grant his reassuring forgiveness to the erring Power before he proceeds to smack it.

* * *

The Nationalisation of the land is an old popular slogan, to which Mr. MacDonald gave no encouragement in his programme, although the I.L.P. has just issued a report on the question. He promises a scheme for agricultural rating reform, and Government loans or guarantees to start co-operative enterprises for supplying manure, machinery, and so on, and to deal with agricultural produce.

Obviously, composed as it is, and depending as it does on the support of other parties, the MacDonald Government could not hope to carry a measure of land nationalisation through Parliament.

The I.L.P., however, has just declared for this reform, and has produced a report giving its views on the subject, in order to prepare the way for realising the project, perhaps, should the Labour Party secure a majority in the next election.

This report, coming from an alleged Socialist organisation, is really a remarkable document.

Having declared that the land should be nationalised, it apparently proceeds to ignore its own dictum, and puts forward the following proposals:—

(1) A revival of war-time Country Agricultural Committees, to consist of one-third farmers, and one-third labourers (nominated through the respective unions in each case), one-third experts nominated by the Ministry.

(2) The C.A.C. should have power to dismiss tenants who cultivate below the standard, or to dispossess landlords who tolerate bad cultivation.

One would not expect to find landlords when the land had been nationalised—but this, remember, is I.L.P. Socialism—we are assured that it is a special brand. The report adds:—

All proposed transfers of tenancy should be registered with the C.A.C., which should promote arable farming, and "make opportunities for the big industrialised farm." As land fell to it by dispossession and voluntary or compulsory purchase, the C.A.C. would farm it through a manager and Board, or lease it to individuals, companies, or co-operative groups.

Apparently these are quite indifferent to the Socialist I.L.P.

The olives of peace sported by the late ex-President Wilson were already faded before Mr. Harold Spender attempted to snatch them from him the other day, in his story of the secret pact for French occupation of the left bank of the Rhine between Messrs. Wilson and Clemenceau. Obviously, there was no secret, but even Mr. MacDonald's desire to be friendly to France cannot dim the effect cast by the revelation that Wilson agreed to the occupation even before Lloyd George. Signor Orlando further discloses the inconsistencies of the late ex-President, by explaining that Wilson accepted the French plans for occupying the left bank of the Rhine in order that Clemenceau would support his own scheme for keeping Italy out of Fiume.

* * *

The theory of Moscow's infallibility in directing the world revolution will be somewhat shaken by the complaints of Zinovief that it was Radek who frustrated the German revolution at the opportune moment, by inducing the Moscow executive to call a halt. We fear that such an obedient revolution as that conceived by Comrade Zinovief would have been a very tame little mouse, indeed, had it appeared.

We cannot attribute, either to Radek or to the Moscow executive of the III. International, the power to hold back so easily a full-blooded revolution, even though the desire to assume such a responsibility may have been theirs.

Nevertheless, we declare that the Moscow executive has failed in such propaganda and organisation as is necessary to prepare the way for Communism. It and its German auxiliary have failed steadily to point out to the German workers that their hope of emancipation lies in the downfall of the private property system, and that they themselves can alone build up Communism in their land.

In spite of the failures of both Socialists and Parliamentary Communists, however, the workers of Germany are still moving leftward. Whilst in Thuringia, the Socialist vote at the recent election dropped from 265,000 to 145,000, the Communist vote rose from 73,000 to 163,000. In a little while the workers will realise that they must take other action and other policies.

* * *

The movement for Indian Independence would be ill-advised to place any hopes on what might emanate from the proffered enquiry into the defects in the working of the present machinery of Indian Government. We do not think the non-co-operators will pay the least attention to such an offer. They will require something much more tangible.

The "emphatic negative" which Sir Malcolm Hailey gave to the suggestion that the Government of India should be transferred from Westminster to the Indian legislature and that Dominion Home Rule should be accorded, shows that the independence movement will not be allowed to win without a struggle.

* * *

The Railway Strike agreement, which allows the railway companies to take "disciplinary action" in the event of any "breach" of "amicable working" between railwaymen, which really means between the members of the rival railway unions, is a serious matter. The clause permits the railway companies to interfere in the relation between Union and Union, worker and worker; indeed it permits the companies to be the sole arbiter in such disputes. That the rival Unions have agreed to it shows how far they have fallen in solidarity. The Union which makes the strongest fight for its members is the Union against which the bias of the companies will naturally be turned.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

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.

The Friend. By Adelaide Phillpotts. (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) This novel, by a new author, contains the following interesting passages.

Mr. Webburn read a passage here and there on the stray papers:—

"Civilisations have perished through war; and education, which alone can destroy it, is being perpetually by it destroyed. . . . Education is promoted by the free mingling of all classes in the community and all races in the world. . . . Thereby diverse individuals come into collision—strike the fire of thought from the flint of the brain. . . . Electricity should help to destroy war. . . ."

"Liberty is character. . . . Liberty is education. . . . Liberty is that state in which a man can develop to their full capacity all his worthiest powers—which obtains from him the fullest and best expression of himself, and renders him wholly self-responsible. . . . Liberty cannot exist without organisation and order, which themselves are dependent on law and rule. . . . Man, to be free, is not necessarily to be fettered—to be kneaded into any sort of artificial state dough and baked hard in the oven of political despotism. . . . The ideal to be aimed at is for man to become his own master—his own sovereign—each man a State unto himself, without interfering with his fellows, but owing allegiance to himself alone."

"Capitalism is like a mustard seed, which, being planted in the world, has germinated, thrust down roots, heaved forth branches, so that the human birds of the earth—the more fortunate—can lodge in the shade of it; while others, less lucky, threaten to set axe at the roots, hack down the tree, and burn it. . . . But this prodigy of economic horticulture will not endure for ever. We may expect that this Gargantuan growth, limbs of which have already withered, will continue to be modified by evolution, and, let us hope, turned, like primeval trees, into something more beneficial to humanity than it now is. Out of its knotty wood may good coal be formed, to light fires in the brightness and heat of which all future men may rejoice."

"There is only one remedy for the evils of unemployment. . . . The principle, which is the corner-stone of the ideal temple of industry, ought to be: That the livelihood and welfare of an individual do not depend upon his employment. This principle involves the recognition of a new relationship between the worker and his work, and his work and his wages. . . . Now men must work that they may eat, and eat just so much as the value in money set upon their work can buy. . . . Men ought to be paid, not for the commercial value of their labour, not even for their willingness to toil, but because they are men and must live. This new link between men and money, replacing that between money and unemployment, might gradually bring about the abolition of money, and substitute for it that free service of mankind by mankind, Utopian models of which the architects of ideals continue patiently and hopefully to build on the treacherous sand of dreams, in spite of their perpetual demolition by the succeeding waves of time."

DEAR EDITOR,

It seems to me that it is necessary to unify all those who agree that Parliament is an institution used by the masters to bolster up their "bandit system." The capitalist Press applauds the leaders of the Labour movement for taking office, because it is thereby hoped to make discontented workers believe salvation is in store for them though being governed by their leaders.

Capitalism is now in a stage of progressive collapse. There is only one chance of its stabilisation. That is, if the workers can be induced to put their faith in a Labour Government. Those who favour an entire change of system are boycotted. All Governments aim at, and are the result of the apathy and ignorance of the many who sanction them. All Government, by parties, or groups, tends to suppress the liberty of the individual mind to express its thought. The Parliamentary

Communist Party must be classified with other parties, because their policy is the leadership of individuals who claim the right to dictate to the party by right of "leadership," and who claim also the right to govern the mass of workers.

I am of opinion that the only hope lies individually in ourselves to educate the workers to what Communism really means before we can expect any progress in our social conditions. We cannot have a system of Communism without a majority of mankind being conscious Communists. When this is accomplished, and the sooner the better, there will be no need to talk about Communism; it will be here.

I am, yours fraternally,
F. A. Gow.

Dundee.

THE MERRICK FRAME-UP.

"Essex County, Massachusetts, bears an unsavoury notoriety for its frame-up attempts on active members of the working class. The Ettor-Giovannitti case it world-famous, and the planting of dynamite by that tool of the mill barons, Breen, with the intent of throwing blame on the striking workers, is equally well known. The masters are making another desperate attempt to railroad an active worker, but his time the scene of the plot is laid in the shoe city of Haverhill in the same county. We refer to the Merrick case.

"In January, 1923, a dynamite bomb was found near the shoe factory of Knipe Bros., Inc., in the Ward Hill district, Haverhill, Mass. The plant had been on strike since the previous October. The firm had just secured an injunction declaring the strike illegal and prohibiting picketing. But despite the injunction the firm could not get workers, and they found that injunctions did not make shoes. A short time after the injunction was issued the "bomb" was found. Great excitement prevailed in Haverhill! News articles and editorials pictured the city in the hands of the "Reds," "Communists," "Radicals," etc., and the police—State, Federal and City—were urged to get busy. For two weeks no arrests were made, although various people known to be radicals were grilled by the police. One morning the captain of the Haverhill police—Captain Hussey—held a conference with the Knipe Bros. firm. That evening the police announced that the firm was to offer a $2000.00 reward for the arrest and conviction of the perpetrators. A few days later John E. Mearrick was arrested by the local police, although State officers were working on the case.

"Merrick was running a small automobile repair shop in Haverhill at that time. He had been compelled to take up this work because the bosses saw to it that he could not get work in the factories. He had been too active. He was called down to the local police station for the apparent purpose of being questioned. While he was in the police station being questioned the local police staged a raid on his shop. They "found" wire, solder, bits, a part of a wooden box, and the back of an alarm clock with two small screws standing on their heads near it, all of which material they claimed was part of the material used in the construction of the bomb. When these things were brought to the police station Merrick was placed under arrest. He was held in $20,000.00 bonds and no one was allowed to see him. At the preliminary hearing the charge of being a principal was dropped and he was held over for he Grand Jury on the charge of accessory. The bail was doubled to $40,000.00 on one charge. The bail was later reduced to $15,000.00 by the Supreme Court, and friends of Merrick secured the bail and had him released. The police claim that there was dynamite in the bomb, but up to date no one but the police and members of the firm of Knipe Bros. have seen the dynamite. It was not produced in court at the time of the hearing. The Grand Jury indicted Merrick on two counts—principal and accessory.

"Immediately after the arrest the local newspapers put Merrick on trial and convicted him in their columns. In news items he was referred to as "the dynamiter," and editorially the authorities were congratulated for running down "the perpetrators of the outrage." He was held up as an "avowed communist," and great fears were expressed at the power held by an organized Communist group in Haverhill. He is not running the repair shop now. After his arrest business dropped away and the rent for his place was doubled. He had to quit. Merrick is married and has lived in and around Haverhill all his life, being born a short distance from the city.

"His trial is due to come up in January. He has absolutely no money. His friends have financed him up to date, both personally and by means of appeals to the working class throughout the country. The Workers' Defence Conference of New England investigated the case and helped to the best of their ability. He needs money now badly in order to secure proper representation in court."—From the Lawrence General Labour Defense Committee.

FROM THE PUBLISHERS

Masses and Man. A fragment of the Social Revolution of the Twentieth Century. By Ernst Toller, translated from the German by Vera Mendel. (The Nonesuch Press, 4s. 6d.)

Toller says of this play that, when he wrote it, "the immensity of the days of revolution had not yet formed an ordered mental picture."

The play is, in fact, chaotic and confused.

Apparently it is a plea for a bloodless revolution: a demand that the revolution shall be a strike and not a war. But it may be that Toller is merely intending to portray the struggles of the idealist amid conflicting impulses and considerations. *The Nameless* may either have been intended to represent the baser passions and spirit of mob cruelty against which *the Woman*, the idealist, is contending, or Toller may have intended *the Nameless* to represent inevitable necessity.

The play is less beautiful, varied and picturesque in diction than is the same author's *Machine Wreckers*. It contains, however, some striking passages; for instance, the gruesome song of the people's sentries in the courtyard:

First Sentry (sings):
My mother bore me—
In a ditch one night,
Lalala la
Hm, hm.
Second Sentry:
Father spawned and ignored me
In his cups one night.
All the Sentries:
Lalala la
Hm, hm.
Third Sentry:
Three years they shove me—
'Tis a jailbird's plight.
All the Sentries:
Lalala la
Hm, hm.

From anywhere the *Nameless* approaches with ghostly, noiseless steps. Stands behind the lantern.

First Sentry:
My father maintained me—
But forgot to pay.
All the Sentries:
Lalala la
Hm, hm.
Second Sentry:
My mother—in pain she
Walks the streets, as they say.
All the Sentries:
Lalala la
Hm, hm.

A bitter contempt for the proletarian mob betrays itself there and in other passages. Contempt for the greedy, vulgar bourgeoisie is also shown. Thus on the Stock Exchange:

Third Banker:
It sounds a good thing;
What's the product?
Fourth Banker:
We call it
Convalescent Home;
For strengthening the Will to Victory.
In fact, it is
State-managed brothel.
Third Banker:
Splendid! I'll take up
One hundred thousand.
One more question,
Who organises?
Fourth Banker:
Experienced generals,
Connoisseurs,
Of tested regulations.
Third Banker:
Is the system
Planned?
Fourth Banker:
By regulation,
As I said.
Three prices
And three categories.
Brothel for officers,
Stay over night.
Brothel for non-coms,
Stay one hour.
And the third brothel,
Men in the ranks,
Stay fifteen minutes.
Third Banker:
I thank you;
When does market open?

There are indications that when Toller wrote this play he was beset by a torturing pessimism. In a dream-picture *The Woman* is shown in a cage. Beside her is the *guide* in the form of a *warder*. He tells her that she is in "the showhouse of humanity." Headless shadows appear and accuse her of their deaths because she kept silence at the storming of the town hall, when weapons were stolen, when the reserves were called up. She protests her innocence, then declares: "I am guilty:"

The guide in the dress of a warder replies:
You fool!
You sentimentalist!
Were they alive
They'd dance about the gilded altar,
Where thousands offered sacrifice.
You, too.
The Prisoner:
I am guilty
Being man!
The Warder:
Masses are guilty.
The Prisoner:
Then I am doubly guilty.
The Warder:
All life is guilt.
The Prisoner:
But, then, it *had* to be
That I am guilty?
The Warder:
Each lives his life.
Each dies his death.
As trees and flowers,
So do men
Grow in a pre-ordained
And fated form.
A form created in unfolding
And in its own destruction
Still created. Find the answer
For yourself.
But life is all
That is.

This is a prisoner's play, written amid the first gloomy horror of the prison following on the crushing defeat of high, bright hopes and dreams.

Prisoners will recognise the dark, hopeless mood under which it was created.

THE FOUNDER OF THE JESUITS.

IGNATIUS LOYOLA. By Henry Dwight Sedgwick. Macmillan, 15/- net.

The author of this work calls it an attempt at "an impartial biography." He confesses, nevertheless, an admiration for Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, or Society of Jesus, and claims him as the foremost Spaniard at the time of Spain's chief glory. In spite of his admiration, Mr. Sedgwick does not succeed in making Loyola an inspiring figure.

Born in 1495, the son of an aristocratic family in the Basque province of Guipuscoa, Loyola was in early youth a rather wild, frivolous young soldier. It is recorded that he attempted, without justification, to claim benefit of clergy in order to escape punishment for some riotous scrape.

When the French crossed the Pyrenees to invade Spain in 1521, and marched on Pamplona, Loyola, who was in the Pamplona garrison, was wounded in the leg. His recovery is said to have dated from the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, and he ascribed it to the intervention of St. Peter. The saint had, however, done his work indifferently, for the bone had been badly set, and had to be rebroken. The convalescence was slow, and during its progress Loyola apparently became what the Salvation Army would call "saved."

After this he took to seeing visions, to fasting and sometimes spent seven hours upon his knees, and flogged himself three times a day. At times he saw a beautiful creature resembling a serpent. This gave him great consolation, and he believed it came from God, but after a time he changed his mind, and decided it was from the devil.

Loyola set off from Pamplona riding on a mule, and fell in with a Moor by the way. Loyola attempted to convince the Moor that the mother of Christ was in truth a virgin. The Moor was willing to admit that she might still be a virgin after she had conceived, but could not understand how it was possible for her to be still a virgin after the birth of the child. Finally the Moor tired of the argument and rode on. When he had gone Loyola wished to gallop after him and stab him in the rear. When he reached the point in the road where he knew the Moor had turned aside, he could not make up his mind whether to turn aside and follow to run the Moor through or not. He allowed the matter to be decided by God, or the mule, letting the reins hang loose on the mule's neck. The mule decided to go straight on, and the Moor was spared.

Having given up his mule, and taken the pilgrim's dress of sackcloth, with staff and gourd, Loyola took to begging, and in 1523 set off for Jerusalem to convert the Turks to Christianity. He sailed from Barcelona. The captain gave him a free passage, but insisted that he should bring his food, and not play the beggar on board. Many others were making the same pilgrimage in those days, and charitable persons helped the beggars upon their way.

In Jerusalem Loyola was received into the Franciscan monastery, but when he announced his intention to remain in Jerusalem saving souls, the prior refused him permission, and gave him orders to leave at once. The Roman Catholic authorities evidently did not wish to have friction with the Turks on account of over-zealous disciples. Loyola agreed to obey the prior. Desiring to make a last visit to the Mount of Olives, to see what are said to be the imprints of Christ's feet on the stone, he went without guide or permit, contrary to Turkish rules. He secured admission by bribing the guard with the gift of his penknife, and, having forgotten which way the footprints pointed, went back again to see, and procured another look by a gift of his scissors. On the way home a messenger sent by the friars came angrily to fetch him.

Returning to Spain after twelve months, Loyola devoted himself to securing an education, and spent twelve years in schools and colleges in Spain and Paris. As a pupil of 34 he began in the grammar school with little boys.

The Renaissance in Italy and the Reformation in Germany were the two movements now stirring Europe. The latter was seriously menacing the prestige of the reactionary and corrupt Roman Catholic Church. Pope Leo X. required much money to maintain the Papal dominion over sundry Italian cities, as well as for the upkeep of his hunting lodge at La Magliana, for jewels, for Latin and Greek manuscripts, and for building the basilica of St. Peters. Therefore he issued "indulgences" which were hawked about all over Europe. A quotation from an advertisement of the indulgences displayed by the hawking "pardoners" is given by Mr. Sedgwick:

> "Whoever puts into the box a tester for a soul in Purgatory, at once sets that soul free, and the soul infallibly goes to Paradise; so, by putting in 2 testers for 2 souls, or a 1,000 for a 1,000 souls, they go forth to Paradise."

Such indecencies were the strength of the Lutheran movement for ecclesiastical reform.

Loyola was for reaction in all directions: he hated both the Renaissance and the Reformation. He disliked and feared the devotion to beauty and the intellectual inquiry, the art and the literature, the study of history and science that were characteristic of the Renaissance, even more than he opposed the Reformation which was a direct attack on the Church itself.

The famous Erasmus, the Dutch scholar who was received with honour in Paris, Rome, Venice, and Padua, and became Margaret Professor of Divinity and Professor of Greek at Cambridge, was more hated by Loyola than Luther himself. Erasmus attacked the corruption of the ecclesiastics, though he did not break away from the Church. He translated the New Testament, and wrote in Latin a work called *Enchiridon Militis Christiani*, at the request of a lady, in order that he might arouse her profligate husband to duty and religion. Loyola was advised to read this latter work, but, according to his own story, felt a numbness of the soul and was obliged to lay it down. The leaders of the Catholic Church eventually condemned the *Enchiridon*, and the Jesuits denounced Erasmus as a heretic. The monks declared that Erasmus had laid the egg which Luther hatched.

Loyola himself was suspected of heresy by the Spanish inquisitors. Whilst at the University of Alcalá de Henares, he and some companions begged their bread, and wore sackcloth garments. They prayed in the streets and discoursed to their admirers in their lodgings. They were suspected of being "illuminate," persons who follow inward illumination, rather than the teachings of the Church, a habit the Church would not tolerate. After an inquiry before the Vicar General, they were ordered, on pain of excommunication, to doff their sackcloth and conform to the ordinary dress of clergy or laity in the Kingdom of Castile. In spite of his doctrine that a person should believe what seems to him to be black is white, if the Hierarchical Church says so, Loyola was indignant at being questioned by the Church authorities. He and his friends changed the colour of their smocks and continued holding services as before. Those who attended the services of Loyola and his friends seem to have been mainly women, a large number being girls of 16 or 17 years. They were seized with fainting and hysterical attacks during the prayers and preaching. A second investigation was soon held by the Church into the activities of Loyola. In April, 1527, he was arrested by the ecclesiastical authorities and later brought before the Vicar General. He was ordered to wear the ordinary dress of clergy or laity, and to refrain from teaching or holding meetings for three years, and thereafter only to do so if licensed by the proper authority. Loyola, so strict a disciplinarian for others, was determined not to submit. He appealed to the Archbishop of Toledo, who merely advised Loyola and his friends to go to the University of Salamanca, and offered money for the journey. The offer was accepted, and the young men continued their preaching, which was probably their only means of livelihood. Loyola was the youngest of eight sons. He had been brought up from childhood by the Governor of Arevalo, and at the Governor's death his widow apparently only gave Loyola two horses and a purse of 500 crowns. He seems to have disposed of these very soon. The young preachers were soon in prison again. After twenty-two days they were found orthodox and liberated. They were given permission to preach provided they would not touch on the difference between mortal and venial sins. Loyola said he could not abide by the sentence. No doubt the spice would have been taken out of his teaching, both for himself and his pupils, if he might not adjudicate on the confessions of frail women. He therefore departed for Paris.

At almost every stage of his career Loyola seems to have been befriended by enthusiastic ladies, who nursed him, fed him, provided him with lodging or money. On this occasion he went first to Barcelona, and there was assisted by women who sent him on his way to Paris with a bill of exchange for 25 crowns in his pocket to sustain him during his studies. The money was stolen from him by a fellow Spaniard who lodged at the same inn. Loyola again took to begging his bread, but this interfered with his studies, and finally, on the advice of a friend, he went to Bruges and Antwerp, where rich Spanish merchants gave him the money he required to return to Paris and study there. In 1529 he began a course in philosophy, and after three years took a master's degree. Then he began a theological course, but left Paris without completing it. He did not preach in the street whilst in Paris, but drilled some of his fellow students in his "Spiritual Exercises." He was twice brought up before the Catholic inquisitors, but his book of "Spiritual Exercises" was this time approved, and he was not punished.

Whilst in Paris Loyola fell in with Pierre Lefèvre, with whom he shared a room, and whom he induced to fast, to sleep on logs of wood and to meditate in the snow. Loyola gathered in Paris a small band of young masters of philosophy who became his first disciples in founding the Society of Jesuits.

Mr. Sedgwick insists that Ignatius Loyola was a reformer. It is true that, if Mr. Sedgwick's account may be relied on, Loyola desired to endeavour that in his order there should be neither corruption nor self-indulgence, but a spartan adherence to the vows of poverty and chastity. It is true that in his own person he seems, in his youth, to have practised with much vigour his precepts on the mortification of the flesh.

He stood, however, pre-eminently for the dark cruelty and superstition of the middle ages against reform and in opposition to all tendencies towards enlightenment.

Mr. Sedgwick quotes documentary evidence which proves that Loyola was unctuously slavish towards powerful personages, both spiritual and temporal, in order to win their support for his order, or to remove their opposition.

The persecution of heretics was at its height whilst he was studying in Paris. He had neither sympathy for the victims nor condemnation for the cruelties. His only effort was to ingratiate himself with the rich and powerful, whatever evils they might be guilty of. Francis I. of France was in those days disputing the right of Charles I. of Spain (Charles V. of Germany) to be Emperor of Germany. Francis at first appeared to favour Church reform, his sister Marguerite had

openly befriended the reformers, and his mother, Louise of Savoy, had shown similar tendencies. When, however, Francis was defeated and taken prisoner by the forces of Charles at the Battle of Pavia, Louise, acting as regent, endeavoured to gain the Pope's support, by attacking the reformers. The Paris University, the Sorbonne and the Parlement were pillars of reaction, and alike opposed to the Protestants. Louise now asked the Sorbonne for advice "how to eradicate Luther's damnable doctrine from their very Christian land." Decrees were issued prohibiting the printing or owning of the Bible in France. A young man accused of heresy had his tongue pierced and was strangled. His body was burned in the *Place Maubert*. A Lutheran, who said there was no advantage in praying for the dead, sprinkling holy water or worshipping images, narrowly escaped death and was sent to prison on bread and water for seven years. A deacon accused of heresy was burned alive in the *Place de Grève*. In 1527 a clerk was buried alive in the same square for blasphemy. In December of that year a boatman was burned there also for Lutheran heresy. A friend of Erasmus, who had translated the *Enchiridon* into French, was strangled and burnt. In 1534 three hundred persons were arrested, and there were many hangings and burnings in public squares. Men were suspended over fires and burnt alive whilst the populace looked on. There were processions of expiation, in which Francis I. walked bare-headed, carrying a wax taper and accompanied by Church dignitaries and nobles. The hangings and burnings continued till Francis found it necessary to come to an understanding with the German Protestants and the Pope, Paul III., thought it advisable that the terror should be stopped. Religious zeal against the heretics then conveniently abated.

Loyola approved these atrocities, and had nothing to say against the ambitions of their unscrupulous perpetrators. He interceded with the Apostolic See to get the fearful Inquisition set up in Portugal to please King John of Portugal.

The inconsistency of the founder of the Jesuits is plainly instanced by his attitude towards begging. He lived for many years by it himself, and, indeed, was ostentatious in his parade of begging his food to show his poverty. He criticised the "Teatini," an order of monks, founded shortly before his own, because they were not allowed to beg for food, but had to wait till it was given them.

Nevertheless, on returning to his native place in 1535, he procured the passage of an ordinance to punish begging. He boasted of this in his memoirs. The ordinance provided that the sheriffs and other officers should choose two citizens, one a cleric, the other a layman, to collect alms for the poor. These alms they should distribute amongst the poor "according to their needs and qualities." Only those poor who had been investigated and listed as unable to work should be entitled to alms. No alms were to be given to mendicants from outside the jurisdiction except those who were unable to work, or who were on a pilgrimage, and even such as these might only be harboured one night in the city.

> "No alms gatherers or solicitors from any hospital, house, or Church, whether in this province or out of it, shall dare to ask any alms, whether from door to door or in any other manner."

Breach of the ordinance was to be punished in the case of the beggar by imprisonment and strokes of the cat; in the case of the donor by fines. Directors of hospitals, who admitted into their hospitals beggars from outside the jurisdiction or persons capable of working, were to be imprisoned and fined.

Strange regulations these from a man who was supposed to be living by door to door begging at the time!

Loyola is supposed to have walked from his native place to Venice, where he lived a year, waiting the arrival of the nine disciples he had enrolled in his new order. Meanwhile, he studied at the University, and prayed at the bedside of incurables. Isabel Roser, who frequently befriended him, provided the means for his support. In the following spring the Jesuits went to Rome, and procured the consent of the Pope to the charter of their order, which most particularly expressed its allegiance to the Pope, "The Roman Pontiff" and "Vicar of Christ." The Pope, Paul III., fresh from subduing riots caused by his own salt taxes, expressed his approval on September 3rd, 1539, and about a year later a "bull of confirmation" was issued.

The Society of Jesus pledged its members to unquestioning obedience to the Pope, and also to its General, whom they were to "acknowledge and reverence" as though he were Christ, "present in person."

Loyola it was who drew up this provision, of course, intending that he would be the General of the order. Later on, after he had become the General, he drew up the constitution of the order. It was here stated that the members must obey the Superior in everything on the mere indication of his will, and that they must "think as the Superior thinks," and believe what he ordains is right, "laying aside, in blind obedience, their own opinions."

After the Pope had approved the order of Jesuits he appointed its members to teach the boys of Rome. The teaching can hardly have had other than bad results, the doctrines of the Society and its founder being so morbid and terrible. Loyola was excessively jealous of his authority, and fierce in his punishments. He advocated flagellation and fasting and mortification of the flesh for young people. He liked to see them neglectful, even dirty in person, regarding this as proper to the young. A youth who found it distasteful to work in the dirty kitchen of the monastery rolled himself in filth, in the hope of overcoming his repugnance to dirt, and in this state returned to his labours in the kitchen. Loyola commended his act.

Father Rodriguez, one of the first members of the order, when journeying with his companions, was offered a bed in which the sheets were dirty and spotted with blood. He went to another hostel in disgust, and afterwards blamed himself because he had not accepted a dirty bed as an exercise in humility. Soon after he was offered sheets which, he was told, had been placed under the dead body of a man who had died of the "lousy disease." He eagerly accepted these sheets, because he saw great lice upon them, and hoped, by suffering the vermin to bite him, he would atone for his previous pride. The lice, it is recorded, did their part in punishing him for his previous pride.

If this is not true, it has been set down as true by the Jesuit chroniclers.

Later on the same Rodriguez became head of the Jesuit Mission in Portugal. It is not surprising to learn that, under his influence, such excesses were committed in the Jesuit College there, that responsible persons protested. For an exhibition of humiliation, to which they had not been ordered by Rodriguez, two students were boycotted by his command, no one being permitted to speak to them. To placate Rodriguez, one of them entered the refectory bare foot, his hands tied and a cord round his neck, to which his tongue was tied between two sticks. The other delinquent came in stripped to the waist, a rope round his neck, and a scourge in hand. These acts of penitence were unacceptable to Rodriguez, because they had not received his permission.

Another lad, whom Rodriguez had refused admission to the college, overcame the denial, by walking through the streets, carrying a skull, and asking the crowd of boys which followed to kick him and throw stones at him. One of the students went through the streets, ringing a bell and shouting: "Hell for all those who are in mortal sin!" Another went out half naked, and tying himself to a pillar in the town, stood there some time, crying: "O Lord Jesus, who for our sins wast tied to a pillar in Pilate's house, forgive the sins of this city!"

Though it was clear that Rodriguez was causing trouble in Portugal, Loyola retained him there for some time, because Rodriguez had become a favourite of the King.

Some curious incidents are recorded of the visit of the Jesuit fathers to Ireland, in 1542. Henry VIII. was then endeavouring to secure his own recognition as the temporal and spiritual head of Ireland and to stamp out Roman Catholicism there. The three strongest Irish princes had been summoned to Dublin to pledge their allegiance to Henry, and two of them had already obeyed. The mission of the Jesuits was to establish peace between the princes of Ireland, in order that they might unite against Henry. They reported their failure, declaring the disease of internal feud to be incurable.

Whilst in Ireland the Jesuits granted pardons for bastardy and incest, of which they wrote there was "a vast amount." They explained the matter thus:

> "Many of these pardons we gave gratis for love of God. From a few we collected some money, but not much, because the country is incredibly poor and we did not wish to get their money, but *to lift them out of sin; for, pardon or no pardon, they would go on doing the same way till the day of their deaths, as ample experience testifies.* But all the money collected we gave away publicly to the poor or to some pious charities, to the great astonishment and edification of the bishops who saw it, and of others who heard of it."

The italics are ours. It is interesting to observe that the Jesuits assumed incest to be harmless, once they had given a pardon for it.

Humanity has travelled some little distance in enlightenment since the sixteenth century; but the Churches are still playing their part in fostering superstition. The following passages from Bishop William Montgomery Brown's "Christianism or Communism?" form a fitting conclusion to this review:

> "Knowledge is the Christ of the World. The saviour-gods of the supernaturalistic interpretations of religion are symbols of this one.
>
> "Ignorance is the devil of the world. The destroyer-gods of the supernaturalistic interpretations of religion are symbols of this one.
>
> "Knowledge consists in knowing facts and truths. Every real fact or truth is a word of the only gospel which the world possesses.
>
> "The desire and effort to learn facts, interpret and live them constitute morality."

SPICE.

HERRIN AGAIN.

Do not imagine that the Ku Klux Klan war in Williamstown County, Illinois, U.S.A., is about Prohibition. It is a continuation of the bitter Labour struggle which has been going on between the miners and the employing class there for a long time.

* * *

FOR EXCESSIVE BRUTALITY.

To Sir John Butcher, a peerage.

* * *

THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. Baldwin has created five more Privy Councillors. On reflection, what a terrible body the Privy Council must be!

* * *

LORD CHELMSFORD.

Mr. Maxton, M.P., believes that Lord Chelmsford was taken into the Labour (?) Cabinet because "the Sea Lords put down their foot."

COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT.
Meetings.

Sundays, 3 p.m., Hyde Park. N. Smyth and others.

Sunday, March 2nd. 7.30 p.m. Hamilton Hall, 375, High Road, Willesden Green. Sylvia Pankhurst and others.

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